

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 28, 1912.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, make us conscious of Thy presence by quickening our minds and conscience, that we may walk in the light of Thy countenance, and, without taking ourselves too seriously, do the work Thou hast given us to do in humility, yet with courage and fortitude, in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] rise?

Mr. HEFLIN. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Tennessee will be pending while the gentleman from Alabama rises to a question of personal privilege. The gentleman from Alabama will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] in referring to me said:

Now, my friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has undertaken, I think, to do something that does not become him, and, in view of the record of his own State, is indefensible.

In another place he says:

Mr. Chairman, in substantiation of what I have read, in response to what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has said in his assaults on the North and labor conditions there, and to the shame of the State of Alabama, I want to show you the evidence of the inhumanity, brutality, and cruelty of his State.

This is a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and reflects upon me and my service here, and charges something that is not true, namely, that I had assaulted the North, and I desire to address the House upon the question of personal privilege.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman has not stated any question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair could not hear distinctly what the matter was. The gentleman from Alabama will read the passage on which he claims he has the right to rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am reading from the RECORD of yesterday, Mr. Speaker, page 7265. The gentleman from Pennsylvania said:

I want, Mr. Chairman, to read a few lines from a letter written by a friend of mine who resides near his [my] home, and I think, possibly, in his district.

And in that letter, Mr. Speaker, there is a reflection not only upon my district, but the entire State.

The SPEAKER. But read what is in the letter.

Mr. HEFLIN. Of course, the letter itself, Mr. Speaker, does not refer to me, but what the gentleman himself said does. He said in another place:

Mr. Chairman, in substantiation of what I have read, in response to what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has said in his assaults on the North and labor conditions there, and to the shame of the State of Alabama, I want to show you the evidence of the inhumanity, brutality, and cruelty of his State—greater than the camps of Siberia and Russia.

Now, the other question of privilege. When I arose and asked unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] objected.

The SPEAKER. Where is that?

Mr. HEFLIN. It is on page 7266, near the center of the second column. I said:

Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to deny me the opportunity to reply to the assault made upon my State by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman from Alabama has already invited all the attacks that he has received.

I had made no statement in my speech that invited any such attack; but the gentleman from Pennsylvania proceeded undisturbed; no one objected upon this side of the House; and when I rose, after this slanderous assault had been made upon my people—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama will suspend. What is the point that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] made?

Mr. DALZELL. That the gentleman has not stated any question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think that that point is well taken. Of course, men might stand up here and abuse Alabama or Missouri or any other State until they were black in the face without laying the foundation for a question of personal privilege. The rule is that the question of privilege rests upon something that affects a man injuriously or scandalously in his representative capacity.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is exactly what I am trying to get at. My grounds, as stated, constitute a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. Now, what part of this is it that the gentleman claims appertains to him in his legislative capacity?

Mr. HEFLIN. The rule says, "The rights, reputation, and conduct of Members, individually, in their representative capacity," and so forth, constitute a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. That is exactly it, and it is a very narrow question, too.

Mr. HEFLIN. Now, it reflects upon me, Mr. Speaker. He says that this man who writes the letter about the conditions in Alabama lives near my home, lives, he thinks, in the district that I represent, and that I can not stand here and make a speech upon these other questions because these conditions that he talks about exist down there; that my position is indefensible; that I have attacked the North, which is not true, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. That part of it, if it is considered scandalous or affecting the gentleman in his representative capacity, would lay the foundation. The Chair can understand very well how the gentleman from Alabama would feel outraged in his feelings if somebody assaults the State of Alabama, but that does not make a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says:

Mr. HEFLIN has undertaken, I think, to do something that does not become him—

The SPEAKER. That was the gentleman's opinion about it.

Mr. HEFLIN (continuing)—

And, in view of the record of his own State, is indefensible.

The SPEAKER. Well, that was just simply in that gentleman's opinion.

Mr. HEFLIN. It forms a basis, Mr. Speaker, to my mind, for a question of personal privilege. I am convinced of that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague will yield to me for a moment, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] shall proceed for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that his colleague be allowed to proceed for 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, in my speech yesterday with reference to the unemployed of this country and the dreadful conditions obtaining under the high protective tariff system of the Republican Party, I reflected upon no particular State, upon no particular Member. I simply arraigned the Republican Party, and stated that for 16 years the Republican Party had been in power and that we had been trying to obtain remedial legislation for the laboring people of the United States and had failed. After I had discussed some of the things that have oppressed the laboring men of America, Mr. FOCHT, of Pennsylvania, arose and reflected upon me and delivered a slanderous assault against my State. The gentleman read a letter—and where it comes from, God only knows; no post mark, no date, no particular convict camp was referred to, and yet it contains a charge against an officer of the State of Alabama with reference to his treatment of a convict. It names no place; it names no man, and yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania calls the writer of this mysterious, slanderous letter a friend of his.

Where is that convict camp where the gentleman says they whipped a black man in the presence of a northern man? There is no truth in that statement. The State that I have the honor in part to represent has a reformatory for young criminals, both white and black, and Alabama stands well with reference to her humane treatment of convicts within her borders. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, Alabama has a law which forbids and punishes cruel treatment of convicts. We have State inspectors, whose duties are to report on the health, sanitary condition, and general treatment of convicts. I do not claim that conditions are perfect in the convict system of Alabama, but I do resent the false and slanderous charge contained in the letter read in this House yesterday regarding that system.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] by his attack on me and on my State yesterday is responsible for my speech this morning. As evidence of that fact I quote from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], a Republican. On yesterday, when I tried to obtain unanimous consent to reply to the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr.

FOCHT], Mr. Good, a Republican, objected, and here is what Mr. AUSTIN said:

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of appealing to my colleague from Iowa to withdraw his objection. This attack upon the State of Alabama came from the Republican side, and I ask in all justice and fair play as a Republican that the gentleman from Alabama have the opportunity to be heard in answer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the point was not made against the gentleman from Pennsylvania, when he read his letter, from this side, and it is unfair for this side to object to the gentleman from Alabama having an opportunity to reply to it.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I shall say now I feel justified in saying on account of what was said here yesterday by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones." For the benefit of the gentleman from Pennsylvania I desire to read from the hearings before the Rules Committee regarding the treatment of free labor in Pennsylvania:

Mr. FREEMAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I understand you have but little time to listen to the numerous arguments that we intended to present, and I will be as brief as possible.

I want to state that we are desirous of this investigation, and expect to prove, as Mr. WILSON stated—

Mr. WILSON is one of the honored Democratic Representatives from Pennsylvania and a true and tried friend of the laboring man.

That there is peonage—

What!

That there is peonage—

Where? In Pennsylvania. [Applause]—

that the coal companies have erected stockades, and that they have resorted to other methods to compel the mine workers and others who are not mine workers, whom they have imported into their mine localities, to work in the mines, keeping them there against their will. I know from experience hundreds of cases where men have escaped, got over what they call the "dead line," where deputies employed by the coal companies are stationed to patrol the outer edges of the company's property. They have some privileges, liberties, inside of the company's property, but if they attempt to get out at any time they are restrained from doing so, and frequently threatened, and often beaten and driven back in.

Where is this? It is in Pennsylvania. No such condition exists in Alabama—not anywhere in the State of Alabama. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If they get over what the imported men call the "dead line" and are captured again, they are taken back forcibly, and in many instances men who have escaped from these stockades in the mining localities have come into the miners' headquarters to obtain information as to how they could get away from the place and to get financial assistance.

Listen. Taken back by force for what? For trying to escape from the clutches of the cruel industrial slavery of the State of Pennsylvania under Republican rule. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They have been sometimes badly wounded; many of them had their heads cut; some of them even shot and otherwise disfigured—

What a fearful condition!

That is the condition that prevails, and the citizens of Westmoreland County know that condition and have known of it in a general way since the strike was inaugurated. We expect that a Federal investigation will put a stop to this. We expect to prove on investigation that men, in order to go to church on Sunday morning, were required to get a pass out from the officials of the coal company or the deputies.

Think of that. These men are not convicts, and yet they are not permitted to go out and worship God on Sunday unless the industrial boss gives them a written pass, and this in the gentleman's State of Pennsylvania.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the black slave in Alabama in the old slave days was treated a thousand times better than were these poor white industrial slaves in Pennsylvania under the reign of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Men guarded in a camp, not permitted to get out, hounded by guards and deputies, lashed and shot and driven back; human beings held in the remorseless grasp of the most despotic industrial slavery in the world! [Applause.] And yet the gentleman [Mr. FOCHT] gets up and talks about a letter that some mysterious fellow, one Ben Phillips, has written. He did not give his name yesterday. If he did, I did not hear it. It was an anonymous letter then so far as this House knew. The letter speaks of punishing a convict in Alabama. Why, I suppose in all the convict camps in the United States they have some discipline; they have some means of punishment for wrongdoing and violated rules; but, as I said before, we have a statute against cruel treatment of convicts in my State.

Mr. Speaker, the condition recited here by this leader of organized labor in Pennsylvania, Mr. Fechan, could not exist in Alabama for one hour. [Applause on Democratic side.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] says that in my speech yesterday I assaulted the North. Why did the gentleman make that statement? What was his purpose in making it? I have made no assault upon the North. Not one word can be found in that speech that can in any way be construed into

an assault on the North. Some of my best friends in this House are northern men. I claim among my friends here some clever Republicans from the North. I have made no assault upon the North, and why did the gentleman from Pennsylvania do me the injustice to say that I had assaulted the North? I want to say to him, and those like him, the time for that kind of political buncombe is past. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. If the gentleman will permit me, I have no doubt that everything the gentleman says about industrial conditions in Pennsylvania is absolutely true; but, in justice to the fair name of our State, I want to call his attention to the fact that very recently Pennsylvania has seen the light, and both of the great political parties have driven out of power the leaders of the organizations in those parties that have been responsible for legislative conditions which have made these horrible things possible in the industrial centers of the State. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And as the promises of these new organizations in Pennsylvania will doubtless be carried out, we hope the future will be able to show conditions which will not justify any such criticism. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend knows that I would have made no reference to these conditions had it not been for the attack on me and on my State by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT]. I am glad the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] made the statement that he did.

Now, then, let me read a sentence from the letter which was read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] yesterday. Listen:

If what I have written you is not what you want, kindly let me know just what you want and I can give you more details.

[Laughter.]

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if this picture of the weeping convict is not strong enough for political purposes drop me a note, and I will fix the next one to suit your purpose. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, when wages have been reduced below a living wage and the laboring man can not get justice from his employer, what else can he do but use his power as an organization and strike? It is often his only remedy, and he has a right to exercise it. Many a time he has been wrong and many a time he has been right, and right is right as God is God. [Applause.] When they struck in Pennsylvania some time ago, what happened to them? They were cruelly treated. Some were beaten with clubs, some were shot, and some were murdered, and we are told that innocent women and children were murdered. Black policemen, it is said, with their clubs struck down women of the white race, American mothers, struck them down and murdered them in Pennsylvania during that strike. Did the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] have this horrible condition in mind when he assaulted my State without foundation of fact [applause on the Democratic side] when he read the mysterious letter from one Ben Phillips, who promised to write any kind of letter if they would just let him know what kind of letter they wanted?

Mr. Speaker, I do not care to detain the House longer now. I regret the necessity that called forth these remarks from me. I made them in obedience to a sense of duty to my State, myself, and the truth of the matters involved.

Mr. Speaker, the issues of this campaign are going to be fought out before the American people, and they are not going to allow anyone to inject in immaterial issues or cause them to lose sight of the greatest of all evils, the high protective tariff system of the Republican Party. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have the House understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] has not been present during the speech just delivered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. I do not know what the wishes of the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be in the matter, but I think that the House ought to know that the speech was made in his absence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend some remarks in the Record on the Military Academy bill, as I shall be necessarily absent when that bill is considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend some remarks in the Record on the Military Academy bill (H. R. 24450). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1912, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6479. An act to authorize the St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co. to repair, alter, or rebuild certain bridges in the State of Arkansas.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 6479. An act to authorize the St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co. to repair, alter, or rebuild certain bridges in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, pending the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, that the Speaker lay before the House House joint resolution 319.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that, pending the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, the House consider the resolution of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 319, making appropriations to supply deficiencies for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1912, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The title to the joint resolution was amended.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate amendment was concurred in was laid on the table.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 24565), with Mr. HULL in the chair.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 6 of the bill, line 7, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to return to page 6 of the bill for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, let us see what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be reported for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding, after the word "rank," in line 7, page 6, as follows: "Provided further, That the service of a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy or of a cadet at the United States Military Academy, who shall hereafter be appointed, shall not be counted in computing for any purpose the length of service of any officer of the Navy: Provided further, That so much of the act approved March 3, 1890, entitled 'An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States,' as contained in section 13 of said act relating to five years' constructive service for officers and warrant officers entering the Navy from civil life, which reads as follows: 'That all officers, including warrant officers, who have been or may be appointed to the Navy from civil life shall, on the date of appointment, be credited for computing their pay with five years' service,' shall not apply to officers and warrant officers appointed to the Navy after the date of the passage of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. I object. I know nothing at all about it, and therefore I object.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to reserve his objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the objection, but I am going to object to going back to this paragraph. Here is a provision of law that I have never seen and know nothing about.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for an opportunity to explain to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I think he will withdraw his objection. The present law provides that the time these young men are attending the Naval Academy at the expense of the Government of the United States shall be counted as service actually rendered, when the fact is that the period of time spent at the naval school is spent for the purpose of training the young men to render service afterwards when they do actually enter the Navy. As is well known, it costs the United States Government nearly \$20,000 to give a young man four years' schooling at this academy. I submit to the gentleman that this four-year period is not service and should not be counted as such.

When the Army bill was before the committee the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HAY, chairman of that committee, introduced, as an amendment coming from the committee, a similar amendment to the one I offer, and it passed the House. I see no reason why this four years' time should be counted as service, when it is not. Further, under the present law, as I understand it, when one enters the staff service from civil life he is, instantaneously, credited with five years' actual service, or five years' service, so to speak. This amendment eliminates that feature. I am told that this will effect a saving of something over \$400,000 annually. It does not apply to those in the school to-day, but it applies to those who enter on and after the passage of this bill. That is the proposition.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENSLEY. Yes.

Mr. KOPP. Has this matter been submitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. HENSLEY. Not to the committee, but it has been submitted to the members of the committee.

Mr. KOPP. Does the gentleman think that it is quite fair to the committee to ask that we pass on such an important matter as this is without the opportunity of any consideration by that committee?

Mr. HENSLEY. I will confess to the gentleman that the matter was not called to my attention in time to have it brought before the Committee on Naval Affairs, or I should have done so.

Mr. KOPP. I might add that it appeals to me as being a sensible amendment, yet it changes a law of long standing and is very far-reaching in its results. It does seem to me we ought to give it careful consideration and not adopt it on a few minutes' discussion in the House.

Mr. LEWIS. May I interrupt the gentleman—

Mr. HENSLEY. Let me answer just one thing. I would have gladly submitted this amendment, which I prepared only yesterday morning—though it was offered in another form on Saturday—to the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I had no opportunity to do so; but I did submit it to the chairman of the committee and, as I understand, he thinks it is right and is ready to support it now.

Mr. BOWMAN. Does not the gentleman think that amounts to a reduction in wages; that this change which he proposes amounts to a reduction in the wages of these cadets?

Mr. HENSLEY. No.

Mr. BOWMAN. If they are reduced in rank, it certainly will amount to a reduction in salary.

Mr. HENSLEY. But they are not reduced in rank.

Mr. BOWMAN. But they are placed at a disadvantage with those who preceded them.

Mr. HENSLEY. It only applies to the future.

Mr. BOWMAN. I think it places them at a disadvantage in relation to those who have gone before. In view of the fact that the cost of living has increased, does the gentleman think it right to reduce these wages when we are asking everybody else to advance them?

Mr. HENSLEY. This House did it in relation to the military bill, and it is identical with the amendment which was then agreed to in that bill. What I am asking is that the House have a chance to pass on it. I am only asking now to return to that section of the bill that makes this proper, and then let the House pass upon this proposition. If a majority of the Members of this House see fit to vote against this amendment, that is their privilege.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have the second navy on earth. It is a necessary arm of defense. There is difficulty in securing sufficient officers, difficulty and more difficulty in securing sufficient seamen to man these great engines of war for our national defense. The law is now that a young man who goes to the Naval Academy commences his service. There is no

more strenuous discipline and service anywhere in the Navy than at the Naval Academy.

Mr. BURLESON. It is the hardest period in his whole career.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the request that the gentleman may have two minutes more in order to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks that the gentleman from Illinois may have two minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENSLEY. Does the gentleman from Illinois believe that if these institutions, the academies at West Point and Annapolis, were thrown open to the young men of the country who measure up to the standard physically, mentally, and morally, they would not be willing to pay their own expenses in receiving the necessary training to qualify them in entering the Government service?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman asks a question. I reply that it is my experience that it is almost impossible to get competent boys to enter the Naval and Military Academies. There are better rewards outside. For two years from my district it has gone without representation at West Point because there was no one desiring to go. At last I think I have a young man who passes up in G who will go.

Now, I want to say these boys are subject to this discipline. These boys are liable to be called out of the academy into active service. They have been heretofore and may again. I am for protecting these boys. Oh, there is not a great many of them, and they do not vote, and the gentleman feels free to attack them, because there is nobody to defend them—

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CANNON. I am not speaking of the gentleman personally.

Mr. HENSLEY. I never have attacked these boys. Let me ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman can get a little time of his own. I am here to say that I stand by the Army and stand by the Navy, and I am ready to vote a marked increase in the pay of seamen and of the minor officers. I am ready to refuse my consent or vote to make two classes of men in the Navy. I wondered the gentleman said it was not called to his attention. We all know of the strife for promotion—length of service—that exists in the Army and Navy. I imagine that it exists because the human animal that is of any account in civilization, resting upon the unit, wants to climb and better his condition. I do not know what the far-reaching effect of this provision might be, but on the merits I am against it; and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not object, I will. If the law is to be amended, let it be done after consideration by the Naval Committee, reported to the House, and passed by the House after consideration. I do not approve of tying this legislation on this great appropriation bill as a rider.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman will object if he ever gets the chance.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. I object for two reasons—first, that I do not want to return; secondly, I know nothing whatever of the subject and was never talked to about it. I exercise the right I have, and I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

That for the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President is hereby authorized to have constructed the following vessels:

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, after line 10, insert, as a separate paragraph:

"Two first-class battleships, each carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessel of its class; to have the highest practicable speed and the greatest practicable radius of action, and to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$6,000,000 each."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I presume the members of the committee will desire more or less discussion on this battleship provision. I would like to see if some arrangement for time can not be made with the chairman of the committee. I will state for the benefit of the chairman that, while he was absent from his seat, I think a cog has been slipped from the understanding of last evening, and the battleship provision is now before the committee. The suggestion I make is that some arrangement be made for discussion of the battleship provision.

Mr. PADGETT. I was called out for just a moment to meet a party who was talking to me about another bill. I supposed

that the debate would proceed for a minute or two until I got back.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I understood from the chairman last evening the matters that had been passed over during the discussion of the bill would be taken up before we got on to the increase in the Navy, but the Clerk began reading the bill under "Increase of the Navy," and came to a point where the battleship amendment should be offered and I had no other course but to offer it. Now, if the chairman desires to go back and take up the matters that were passed over before we take up the increase, I ask unanimous consent that we return to that portion of the bill and that my amendment be held as pending.

Mr. PADGETT. I would be glad to do that and dispose of matters back of that with the exception of the question of the eight-hour amendment. I stated to the committee the other day when the amendments were offered that I did not think it was good legislation to inject all through the bill provisions with reference to the eight-hour law and that I was going to ask unanimous consent at the appropriate place under the provision for the increase in the Navy to incorporate the bill that was passed by this House by a large majority of both sides of the House at the present session and is now pending in the Senate reported by the committee without amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that the motion just offered by me be considered as pending and that the chairman of the committee be permitted to go back to such portions of the bill as he wishes to have disposed of before we take up the increase in the Navy.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will yield—

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCALL. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] is proposing to offer an amendment to the amendment of my colleague, and I simply wish to have his right saved.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. There will be a long debate over the coal provision first—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the amendment just offered by him be considered as pending and that the committee return to unconsidered portions of the bill and take them up for consideration. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to say this in reference to the matter of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY]. I said the other day when he offered the amendment that there should be some amendments to his amendment in order to put it in proper shape and that it should be withdrawn and that he should put it in shape, and I further said to him so far as I was concerned that I was perfectly willing that they should return and each have an opportunity to offer his amendment, which he did this morning. Of course I had no right to bind anybody except myself.

Now, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENSLEY] desires that I should ask unanimous consent to return to the provision.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me? Has the gentleman prepared the amendment of which he speaks?

Mr. PADGETT. I am speaking of the one offered by the gentleman awhile ago.

Mr. CANNON. Has the gentleman prepared the amendment he thought ought to be made?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; he has prepared the one he indicated to me that he wanted to prepare along those lines.

Mr. CANNON. It meets the gentleman's approval, does it?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; personally I have no objection to it.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. This is legislation?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman have any fear that his committee would not report that bill for consideration?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know what the feelings of the committee are. I have not talked with the members of the committee. I do not know the feeling of any member of the committee except the gentleman who offered the matter.

Mr. BUTLER. We had no hearing on it?

Mr. PADGETT. None whatever.

Mr. CANNON. My objection to it is twofold: First, on the merits; and, second, it ought to be considered and passed upon its merits as a separate act of legislation and not fastened on this great money bill.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this matter might well be considered by the committee in connection with the personnel bill, on which we are now having hearings and to which it very properly relates.

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HENSLEY. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Tennessee and all the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs that, as I understood the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, there would be no question about returning to this portion of this bill, so that I should be permitted to offer this amendment at this time. I had no idea but that the House would be given an opportunity to pass upon the merits of the amendment. Now, whether I misunderstood the gentleman from Tennessee or not I am unable to say, but I submit that to me it appears unfair to have the situation that is presented here at this time.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, there can be no misunderstanding whatever as to the position of myself in the House. It is of record, and it speaks for itself and is known of all who were here. The gentleman asked unanimous consent on the floor to return to this point and offer an amendment. Pending the question of unanimous consent, and before unanimous consent was granted, while the discussion was going on pro and con, I suggested to him that his amendment was not in proper form and should be amended to be in proper shape, and then the matter was withdrawn. I said to him that, so far as I was concerned, he should have an opportunity to ask to return to this place and offer his amendment. I have granted that opportunity this morning. He has returned. He has submitted his request, and it has been declined. I am not responsible for that in any way, and I did not mislead him, for I simply stated to him that he could have opportunity to return.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further discussion the Clerk will report the first item passed over unfinished.

Mr. PADGETT. Let us return to the question of coal transportation, on page 26.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 26, line 7, after the word "dollars," insert:

"Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in time of peace for transporting coal from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans for the use of naval vessels or navy yards on the Pacific Ocean, except this limitation shall not apply to vessels crossing the Pacific Ocean or stationed in the Hawaiian Islands or in the Philippine Islands, or to navy yards situated in these islands."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Washington, the author of the amendment, if we can not agree upon time for closing debate on this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think so. What time would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. PADGETT. I suggest that 30 minutes will be ample.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Thirty minutes on a side?

Mr. PADGETT. No; all told.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. We never have disposed of it heretofore in 30 minutes. On a question of this importance I do not think that is long enough.

Mr. PADGETT. It has been debated over and over again.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If the gentleman is willing to confess that my amendment ought to pass, I would be willing to limit the time.

Mr. PADGETT. I never would confess that if I had the reasoning faculties that I have now.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Which did not agree with the authorities before.

Mr. PADGETT. Then I will agree to 20 minutes to a side.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think the gentleman ought to allow 30 minutes on a side, because this is one of the most important features in the bill. I would rather proceed under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman may control one-half the time or the Chair can control it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Why not make it 30 minutes on a side?

Mr. PADGETT. That is too long a time.

Mr. SIMS. Members will get up and leave the Hall.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Why not proceed under the five-minute rule?

Mr. PADGETT. I wish to serve notice now that at the end of 40 minutes I shall move to close debate under the five-minute rule on this paragraph and all amendments to it.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Do it now.

Mr. PADGETT. I move to close debate on this paragraph and the pending amendment, and all amendments, at the end of 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that a motion to close debate is not in order at this time.

Mr. PADGETT. That is true, as there has been no debate upon it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Why does not the gentleman ask unanimous consent?

Mr. PADGETT. I ask unanimous consent that at the end of 40 minutes debate be closed upon this paragraph and all amendments, and that one half the time be controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the other half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes, and that one half the time be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Is there objection?

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHARP. Does the gentleman mean to include in this 40 minutes any amendment that may be offered to the subsequent portion of the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. This is the only paragraph to which it applies. We have read all of the bill except this, down to the increase of the Navy.

Mr. SHARP. But this does not apply to the increase of the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. It does not apply to it in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection to the request, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the members of the committee I think it might be well to give a brief history of this proposed amendment. Two years ago it was offered by me at the suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and a vote was taken upon it after a limited discussion, and it was defeated in the committee by one vote.

A year ago I offered a similar amendment, and after debate it was agreed to in the Committee of the Whole by a 3 to 1 vote. It went over to the Senate, and at about 2 o'clock on the morning of the 4th of March the conferees came to me and said that if it was insisted upon it might defeat the entire naval appropriation bill. So, under those circumstances, as the one who had offered the amendment, I did not urge that it be retained.

One would think from these expressions of the sentiment of this House, gentlemen on that side of the aisle having voted almost unanimously in favor of it, some attention would have been given to it by the Navy Department, but such has not been the fact.

I have attempted, without any success whatever, to induce the Navy Department to make use of the coal upon the Pacific coast for some purposes.

Now, it costs to-day to take a ton of Pocahontas coal from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean between \$6 and \$6.50 a ton. The Pacific coast coal laid down at the Bremerton Navy Yard costs \$4 a ton. In other words, the freight upon the Pocahontas coal costs from \$2 to \$2.50 more than the entire cost of the coal from the Pacific coast laid down at the navy yard.

The objection has been raised that the Pacific coast coal is not equal to the Pocahontas coal, and that is true to a limited extent, but it only varies from 6 per cent to 10 per cent, according to how it is used. But I call the attention of the committee to this fact, that it costs the Government from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 a year additional to send this coal around to the Pacific coast, and that when war comes, if it ever does come, we will be compelled to use the Pacific coast coal, because we have no means of transporting Pocahontas coal rapidly, and when it is taken over there and stored it soon becomes of less value than the Pacific coast coal. So I ask this question of this House: If we are compelled, as we would be, to use Pacific coast coal in time of war, why should we continue, at an expense of one to two million dollars a year, to use this high-priced coal in time of peace?

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Has the gentleman presented this argument before the committee, and is there anything in the hearings on this proposition?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I did not, because the committee was familiar with it; it has been argued on the floor of this House, and it passed the House by a vote of 3 to 1 a year ago, and the committee was familiar with all the facts.

Mr. GOOD. Did any of the officers of the Navy appear before the committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. They did not appear before the committee, so far as I know. We had a hearing in the Navy Department on January 24, 1912, in which this matter was thoroughly discussed—gone into fully.

Mr. GOOD. Then there is nothing in the hearings?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; there is not in regard to this matter, so far as I know.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the Navy Department would spend the same amount of money that it costs extra for Pocahontas coal for two or three years they could develop the coal fields of Alaska and get a better coal than the Pocahontas. I am not going to make the charge that there is any collusion between the Navy Department and the Pocahontas Coal Co., but such statements have been made by high authority, and insinuations have been made on the floor of the House that such is the case. I want to read a few words from a speech made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] on this question when it was up a year ago. He said:

Mr. Chairman, I agree thoroughly with the proposition advanced by the gentleman from Washington. The closest corporation in this country is the combination between the Pocahontas coal people and the Navy Department, and it has been so for 20 years. I know that during the Spanish-American War, when Alabama coals that were perfectly good for steaming purposes were offered to the Navy Department for \$3.25 a ton over the ship's rail at Mobile, only a night's sail from Tampa, the Navy Department bought Pocahontas coal and shipped it by rail to Tampa at an expense of \$9.60, and that proposition has been kept up ever since.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, continuing, said:

There is no reason in time of peace why these Pacific coals could not be used for our Navy. They are absolutely as good steaming coals as the Pocahontas coal. They are the same class of coals as the Alabama grades of coal, and 20 years ago, when Mr. Herbert was Secretary of the Navy, he sent out the battleships *Montgomery* and *Mobile* to test the Alabama coals, and the only difference between them and the Pocahontas coal was not that they did not produce as much steam power or that they did not have as great a steaming radius per ton per mile as the Pocahontas coal, but that they produced a little more smoke and clogged the flues a little sooner, a few hours sooner in a 40-hour trial. Now, what have these men got to do but clean the flues?

Then he added these words of warning, that I want to call to the attention of gentlemen on that side of the aisle, on February 21, 1911:

This business of making the Navy Department a close corporation, bound in here between the Allegheny Mountains and the Potomac River, has got to stop, or you will raise a prejudice against the Navy in this country that will bring more injury to it than anything else you can do. You want to build all your battleships on the eastern coast line. You want to buy all your supplies on the eastern coast line. You want all the navy yards there. You do not want the people of the United States to have any share in this Navy except in a few States. You might as well make up your minds, if you want a big navy and a navy that will be popular with the people of the United States, you have got to stop this, and you had better stop it right now by voting for the amendment of the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman comment on this statement, found on page 314 of the hearings before the Naval Committee, in which Admiral Cowie says:

This question of coal supply on the Pacific has been one so vexing on account of its vital importance to our fleet for its maintenance in the Pacific that, with the opportunity confronting us whereby high-grade fuel could be obtained, the bureau believes that every possible effort should be made by the department to cause Congress to take advantage of this opportunity to solve this problem and provide for the safety of the country by making the necessary appropriation for mining and operating these fields, whose product alone will insure the safety of our fleets in the Pacific.

Will the gentleman state whether or not there is any foundation in fact for that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will answer it by saying that they have never made a fair test of the Pacific coast coal. They have been promising to make tests ever since I have been a Member of this House. I asked them to make the test and report here so that it could be used two years ago, but they failed to do it, and I also repeated that a year ago and they also failed. They are still making tests on the Pacific coast coal or promising to do it.

In the hearing that we had before the Navy Department last January they ended the hearing by promising to make a fair and full test of the coal of the Pacific coast, but they have never done so.

Now, I want to read one more statement from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], who has more knowledge upon this subject than any man in this House. He says:

I wish to register here a complaint that the Navy Department is not encouraging the development of appliances so that it can use the other coals. When it found, for instance, that the coal in Alabama approximated to the needs of the Navy it would have been in the line of economy and the best interests of the Government to have undertaken to develop smoke-consuming devices and other devices, so that the department could then use Alabama coal.

The same applies to the Pacific coast coal, not only that mined on the mainland but that in Alaska, and the Navy Department has not shown great interest in developing additional sources of supply that would prove of great, if not vital, importance in time of war, and we are put to millions of dollars of expense, perhaps, unnecessarily.

So the whole question is, Are we going to pay one or two million dollars a year unnecessarily for Pocahontas coal and permit the Navy Department to make no effort whatever to learn the use of other coals that they will have to use in the time of war?

No gentleman on the floor of this House and no man representing the Navy Department can say that in case of war they will not be compelled to use these Pacific coast coals. Had they not better get accustomed to them in time of peace? Would it not be better for this Government, instead of spending this one or two million dollars extra each year, to compel the Navy Department to experiment with Pacific coast coals, become accustomed to their use, and have some mines developed out there that would be ready to furnish fuel to them in time of emergency?

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the essence of this whole matter is to prohibit the Government from getting the benefit of the open market and the best terms that can be had in the purchase of its coal, and the best coal, and to limit the Government to a restricted area. It is nothing more or less than a proposition to create a coal trust for the benefit of some coal miners in the State of Washington. We may just as well understand fully and frankly what it is. That is all that it is.

With reference to the question of tests, the Navy Department has repeatedly made tests. The Bureau of Mines of the Government, a different department, has made several tests, and every single one of these tests, without exception, has shown that the coal was not suited and was not fit for use in the vessels of the Navy. I have here memoranda of various tests that have been made by the departments of the Government. The department, through the Bureau of Steam Engineering, made tests of Washington State coals and various other coals—British Columbia coal, and coal from Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico—giving the names of the mines, et cetera.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Is there any evidence of any test having been made of Alaska coal?

Mr. PADGETT. Alaska coal is not available. The Matanuska coal fields are 120 miles from a railroad, and the Naval Committee has had up at this session, not in a formal way, but we have been gathering evidence and having communications, and have submitted the matter to the Navy Department, the matter of Alaskan coal, and there is a reference on page 313 of the hearings to the Alaska coals, with a view of getting them. There are in Alaska, at Matanuska, fields of coal that are of sufficient grade and test, but that coal is not available. Two gentlemen who were interested in the development of those fields were to see me, and I said to them that we would gladly cooperate with them to secure the coal whenever they put a railroad to it. They intimated to me that they wanted the Government to guarantee their bonds. I said to them that I was not willing to advocate that proposition, but for the reservation of the lands and for making contracts and all of that I was willing to cooperate.

Mr. KAHN. I understand that there was a test made of Alaska coal, and that it showed that it had 1,000 British thermal units more than any other coal that is mined in this country.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it does not show that much. It is referred to in the hearings. I think it shows a total of something like fifteen thousand and odd.

Mr. KAHN. More thermal units?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; here it is:

From the reports of analyses made from samples recently obtained by the Director Bureau of Mines, while in Alaska, from the Matanuska and Bering fields, it is shown that these coals are exceptionally low in ash and sulphur, and exceedingly high in heating value, the British thermal units in some cases running as high as 15,400 as received, while the best eastern coals average a little under 14,800 British thermal units.

Mr. KAHN. That is what I had reference to. Does not the gentleman think, in view of the fact that these coal fields in Alaska have not been developed, it would be a good thing on the part of the Government to open them up for the use of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I have indicated that I was perfectly willing to do it and would be glad to cooperate, but I am not willing to forbid the Government getting the benefit of the best coal as long as these fields are 120 miles from a railroad.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman from Tennessee believe that it is well to pursue the policy that we have pursued, namely, that the Government should not guarantee the bonds or encourage the building of the roads, and should continue to make it impossible for private capital to develop those coal fields and get the transportation? Upon the whole, is it not better that we should do without the Alaska coal for this and perhaps many other generations, and keep it there stored, as it always has been, for the benefit of a remote posterity?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I am not willing to go that length. I am not willing to adopt that policy. Now, Mr. Chairman, in my time I am going to ask that the Clerk shall read this memorandum furnished by the Paymaster of the Navy, that is a complete answer to this proposition, and I ask the attention of the committee to the reading of that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1912.
MEMORANDUM RE COAL, PACIFIC COAST.

NAVY YARD, MARE ISLAND, CAL.—COAL FOR YARD USE.

1. After a full investigation of western-coast coals available for use at the navy yard, Mare Island, it is found that only one company at San Francisco was able to furnish western-coast coal—Black Diamond coal from State of Washington, cost \$6.75 per ton on barges alongside sea wall, Mare Island, and \$6 per ton on Navy barges at company's bunker. Cost of eastern coal at yard, \$8.19 per ton.

2. Efficiency reports of Pocahontas and western-coast coals prove that for the same work as would be obtained from one ton of Pocahontas coal the cost of Black Diamond coal (State of Washington coal) would be between \$10 and \$11, showing an increased cost of western-coast coals where used, or between \$2 and \$3 over the cost of Pocahontas coal.

3. The Navy Department issued orders during the latter part of 1911 for commandants at Mare Island and Puget Sound to use western-coast coals for yard and craft, provided same could be done at not greater cost than the use of eastern coals. From the reports from the navy yard, Puget Sound, on the use of western-coast coals for yard craft, it has been noted that coal used aboard tugs does not furnish sufficient steam, and does not give satisfaction. It requires constant use of jet, and when tugs are handling large ships it is almost impossible to hear signals from the bridge of the ship when jet is going. The coal does not give sufficient steam for tugs to handle large ships in safety. Coal gives 80 per cent ashes and fires have to be cleaned every hour. The coal used is one of the best State of Washington coals, and coal was washed to be cleared of impurities before being received. The boiler house of the U. S. S. *Philadelphia*, station ship, at Puget Sound, used about 10 tons a day of western coal, when an average of only 2.94 tons of eastern coal had been used heretofore. The present cost of eastern coal at Puget Sound is about \$7.59, and the cost of western coal is between \$3.66 and \$4, which price is a low figure for western coal.

4. Naval officers who are responsible under the department for the efficiency of our ships have uniformly taken the ground that our ships of war should use only the highest grade of coal. In foreign ports only the best grade of Welch coal from the admiralty list are purchased, except in such of these ports where the best American coals can be had at satisfactory prices. In our own ports, Pocahontas, New River, and Georges Creek coals are procured. It has been found from experience that the best coal is cheaper as it contains a greater heating efficiency, and a still more important fact, that it is not as subject to spontaneous combustion, and therefore will stand storage in coal piles, and in bunkers of ships of war for a much longer period than inferior coals.

5. The main source of supply of coals for the Navy is at present obtained from the largest producers of the best grades of Pocahontas, New River, and Georges Creek coals. The purchase of coal for the Navy has been made a matter of deep and careful study, and the department now feels assured at all times of a sufficient supply of coal to meet any needs from the mines producing the highest grades of steaming coals in this country and at the lowest market rates.

6. The coal supply for the Navy in the Pacific has become a matter of great national importance. The department in its endeavor to provide for a satisfactory quality of coal for the Pacific has caused careful investigation to be made under the direction of the Bureau of Mines of all the principal coals in the western coast States, as well as in British Columbia. Nine of the best of these coals have been tested under the boilers of some of our largest vessels in the Pacific, and the results of these tests have shown that these coals do not possess the required characteristics for naval fuel, the following objections being most noticeable:

- Excessive smoke.
- Increased consumption of coal, making a corresponding reduction in the steaming radius of the fleet.
- An increase in the number of colliers to supply coal.
- Deteriorating effects on the boilers.
- Increase of labor in handling coal and ashes in the fireroom.

BRITISH COLUMBIA COAL—PRICE AT SAN DIEGO, CAL.

7. During the summer of 1911, while the Pacific Fleet was at San Diego, Cal., there was somewhat of a shortage of coal for the fleet. An inquiry as to the available fuel suppliers at that port was made, and it was found that 2,000 tons of Nainaimo coal (British Columbia) could be purchased at \$8.75 per ton. Roughly speaking, it takes 2 tons of Nainaimo coal to do the same work as 1 ton of Pocahontas—Pocahontas coal at that time costing on the Pacific coast, at Mare Island, about \$8.50 per ton, including transportation. In other words, the department was called upon to pay \$17.50 for \$8.50 worth of work, not to mention ill effects of western coal on boilers, etc., and reduction of steaming radius.

8. The best British Columbia coal (Crows Nest Pass or Fernie) costs at Seattle, including duty (about 50 cents per ton), about \$7.55 per long ton. This coal is less efficient than eastern coal and costs but a fraction less.

9. Shipments to Pacific coast, 1906-1911, inclusive, for past six years:

Number of tons of eastern coal shipped.....	676,000
Cost for transportation.....	\$3,476,000
Cost for both the coal and transportation.....	\$5,359,000

Issues of coal at Mare Island and Puget Sound (tons).

1907.....	38,410.00
1908.....	142,943.47
1909.....	95,228.39
1910.....	73,273.44
1911.....	89,484.48

Total tons issued during the past 5 years..... 439,348.78

Shipments to Pacific coast, fiscal year 1911.

Shipments.	Tons.	Cost of coal.	Transportation.	Average per ton.		
				Coal.	Transportation.	Coal and transportation.
Foreign.....	124,087	\$327,347.10	\$660,409.02	\$2.64	\$5.29	\$7.96
American.....	34,756	93,841.20	223,514.59	2.70	6.43	9.13
Total.....	158,843	421,188.30	883,923.61	2.65	5.56	8.85

10. The department has made 7 tests of Washington State coals, 3 tests of British Columbia coal, and on June 4 a test of 900 tons of Primero coal, from the State of Colorado, will be started on the armored cruiser *Maryland*, this coal costing \$9.50 per ton on lighters in San Francisco Harbor. The prices of Washington State coal in Seattle for test have ranged from \$4.10 to \$5.40 a ton; the cost of British Columbia coal at Vancouver has ranged from \$5.80 to \$5.85 per ton. None of the coals so far tested has been found economical or satisfactory for naval use. With the battleship fleet operating in the Pacific it is estimated that 500,000 tons of eastern coal will be required on that coast, and by the use of western coast coals so far tested the consumption would be 45 per cent more than Pocahontas coal, so it will be seen that the requirements of Washington State coal would be about 725,000 tons a year. The department is doing everything in its power to procure satisfactory west-coast coal, and will continue tests with that end in view.

T. J. COWIE.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute remaining. Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield that to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LITTLEPAGE].

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I have not more time. I simply want to say to this House that there is the official statement you have heard read from one of the important bureaus of our Government, a Government which every patriotic man ought and does love. This statement shows that if we let the conditions alone as they are now everything is all right and all will be well. If this amendment is adopted, as the statement shows, it means that it will cost the Government 45 per cent more for the coal which this amendment seeks to force upon this Government than the present cost. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington on the 21st day of February, 1911, when it seemed there were five Republican Congressmen here from West Virginia, not one of whom, according to the Record, opened his mouth in opposition to the same, and on this account it did pass this House by the great majority the gentleman mentioned, is found on page 3228 of the Record, and reads as follows:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to transport coal from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean.

Had I then been a Member of this House, the amendment should not have passed without the same exposition then I have been endeavoring to make during the past two days of the amendment under consideration, which reads as follows:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the time of peace for transporting coal from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans for the use of the naval vessels or the navy yards on the Pacific Ocean, except this limitation shall not apply to the vessels crossing the Pacific or stationed in the Hawaiian Islands or in the Philippine Islands or to navy yards situated on those islands.

The same amendment as of a year ago on a much larger scale and much greater importance to us all and to this Republic.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the candid consideration of this House the following reliable information, as it comes to me from a thoroughly reliable source, and I impart it to my brother Congressmen in absolute good faith, and trust you will give it credence with the belief upon your part that I am faithfully endeavoring to treat this important matter with candor and with perfect fairness and frankness when I say this amendment is in the interest of the Pacific slope or the western coal combine:

MEMORANDUM RE COAL, PACIFIC COAST.

NAVY YARD, MARE ISLAND, CAL.—COAL FOR YARD USE.

1. After a full investigation of western coast coals available for use at the navy yard, Mare Island, it is found that only one company at San Francisco was able to furnish western coast coal—Black Diamond coal from State of Washington cost \$6.75 per ton on barges alongside sea wall, Mare Island, and \$6 per ton on Navy barges at company's bunker. Cost of eastern coal at yard, \$8.19 per ton.

2. Efficiency reports of Pocahontas and western coast coals prove that for the same work as would be obtained from one ton of Poca-

hontas coal, the cost of Black Diamond coal (State of Washington coal) would be between \$10 and \$11, showing an increased cost if western coast coals were used, or between \$2 and \$3 over the cost of Pocahontas coal.

3. The Navy Department issued orders during the latter part of 1911 for commandants at Mare Island and Puget Sound to use western coast coals for yard and yard craft, provided same could be done at not greater cost than the use of eastern coals. From the reports from the navy yard, Puget Sound, on the use of western coast coals for yard craft it has been noted that coal used aboard tugs does not furnish sufficient steam and does not give satisfaction. It requires constant use of jet, and when tugs are handling large ships it is almost impossible to hear signals from the bridge of the ship when jet is going. The coal does not give sufficient steam for tugs to handle large ships in safety. Coal gives 80 per cent ashes, and fires have to be cleaned every hour. The coal used is one of the best State of Washington coals; and coal was washed to be cleared of impurities before being received. The boiler house of the U. S. S. *Philadelphia*, station ship at Puget Sound, used about 10 tons a day of western coal when an average of only 2.94 tons of eastern coal had been used heretofore. The present cost of eastern coal at Puget Sound is about \$7.59, and the cost of western coal is between \$3.05 and \$4, which price is a low figure for western coal.

4. Naval officers who are responsible under the department for the efficiency of our ships have uniformly taken the ground that our ships of war should use only the highest grade of coal. In foreign ports only the best grade of Welch coal from the admiralty list are purchased, except in such of these ports where the best American coals can be had at satisfactory prices. In our own ports, Pocahontas, New River, and Georges Creek coals are procured. It has been found from experience that the best coal is cheaper, as it contains a greater heating efficiency, and a still more important fact that it is not as subject to spontaneous combustion, and therefore will stand storage in coal piles and in bunkers of ships of war for a much longer period than inferior coals.

5. The main source of supply of coals for the Navy is at present obtained from the largest producers of the best grades of Pocahontas, New River, and Georges Creek coals. The purchase of coal for the Navy has been made a matter of deep and careful study, and the department now feels assured at all times of a sufficient supply of coal to meet any needs from the mines producing the highest grades of steaming coals in this country and at the lowest market rates.

6. The coal supply for the Navy in the Pacific has become a matter of great national importance. The department, in its endeavor to provide for a satisfactory quality of coal for the Pacific, has caused careful investigation to be made, under the direction of the Bureau of Mines, of all the principal coals in the western coast States, as well as in British Columbia. Nine of the best of these coals has been tested under the boilers of some of our largest vessels in the Pacific, and the results of these tests have shown that these coals do not possess the required characteristics for naval fuel, the following objections being most noticeable:

- Excessive smoke.
- Increased consumption of coal (making a corresponding reduction in the steaming radius of the fleet).
- An increase in the number of colliers to supply coal.
- Deteriorating effects on the boilers.
- Increase of labor in handling coal and ashes in the fireroom.

BRITISH COLUMBIA COAL—PRICE AT SAN DIEGO, CAL.

7. During the summer of 1911, while the Pacific Fleet was at San Diego, Cal., there was somewhat of a shortage of coal for the fleet. An inquiry as to the available fuel suppliers at that port was made, and it was found that 2,000 tons of Nainaimo coal (British Columbia) could be purchased at \$8.75 per ton. Roughly speaking, it takes two tons of Nainaimo coal to do the same work as one ton of Pocahontas—Pocahontas coal at that time costing, on the Pacific coast at Mare Island, about \$8.50 a ton, including transportation. In other words, the department was called upon to pay \$17.50 for \$8.50 worth of work, not to mention ill effects of western coal on boilers, etc., and the reduction of steaming radius.

8. The best British Columbia coal (Crow's Nest Pass or Fernie) costs at Seattle, including duty—about 50 cents per ton—about \$7.55 per long ton. This coal is less efficient than eastern coal and costs but a fraction less.

9. Shipments to Pacific coast, 1906-1911 inclusive, for past six years:

Number of tons of eastern coal shipped	676,000
Cost for transportation	\$3,478,000
Cost for both the coal and transportation	\$5,355,000

Issues of coal at Mare Island and Puget Sound (tons).

1907	38,419.00
1908	142,943.47
1909	95,228.30
1910	73,273.44
1911	80,484.48

Total issued during the past five years..... 430,348.78

Shipments to Pacific coast, fiscal year 1911.

Shipments.	Tons.	Cost of coal.	Transportation.	Average per ton.		
				Coal.	Transportation.	Coal and transportation.
Foreign.....	124,087	\$327,347.10	\$390,409.02	\$3.64	\$5.29	\$7.96
American.....	34,736	93,841.20	223,514.59	2.70	6.43	9.13
Total.....	158,823	421,188.30	613,923.61	2.65	5.50	8.85

10. The department has made seven tests of Washington State coals, three tests of British Columbia coal, and on June 4 a test of 900 tons of Primero coal from the State of Colorado will be started on the armored cruiser *Maryland*—this coal costing \$9.50 per ton on lighters, in San Francisco harbor. The prices of Washington State coal in Seattle for test have ranged from \$4.10 to \$5.40 a ton; the cost of British Columbia coal at Vancouver has ranged from \$5.80 to \$5.85

per ton. None of the coals so far tested have been found economical or satisfactory for naval use. With the battleship fleet operating in the Pacific, it is estimated that 500,000 tons of eastern coal will be required on that coast, and by the use of western coast coal so far tested the consumption would be 45 per cent more than Pocahontas coal, so it will be seen that the requirements of Washington State coal would be about 725,000 tons a year.

Now, let me say to you in addition to the foregoing that a saving of 45 per cent in the cost of coaling the ships, and especially with the best steam coal on earth, is a matter of vital importance to the Treasury Department of the Government, much less of vital importance to the Government in having the best coal to be procured on the continent; and I have no hesitancy in saying to the American people, through this Congress, that in West Virginia is to be found the finest coking and steam coal there is to be found anywhere on this earth. We are very proud of our natural wealth in West Virginia; we are very proud of our coal miners who mine the coal; we are very proud of our operators who have invested their life's savings in the development of our coal mines; who have come with their families away from the cities and builded their homes, in many instances, in the woodland, near their mines, where they can be with their property day and night, in order to facilitate in every way possible the supply of their products to the markets of the country.

I want to give you here an analysis of the New River smokeless coal, some of which the Navy Department of the Government is using. My distinguished friend Mr. HUMPHREY, from the great State of Washington, has made a great fight upon the floor of this House to protect and promote the material interests of those engaged in the mining of coal beyond the Rockies and along the Pacific slope. He has quoted from a speech made by Mr. UNDERWOOD, a very distinguished Member of this House and one of the most lovable characters in American politics, which speech was made some time ago—before I came here—and in which, he says, Mr. UNDERWOOD intimated that there was a combination and conspiracy between the Navy Department and the Pocahontas coal operators. Mr. UNDERWOOD will not say this now.

While my district in West Virginia does not include the Pocahontas region, which is a very wealthy part of my sister State, Virginia, I know the majority of the men engaged in the coal industry there, and there is no better class of men on this continent than the men engaged in the coal business in the Pocahontas region. They went into that rugged wilderness country, bought the land, built railroads, constructed houses, built tipples, opened up coal mines, and spent vast fortunes of money in getting in position to realize something upon their heavy investments. They are solvent, reliable, patriotic, and they are just as honest as the day is long, and God Almighty has never created better people than those dwelling within the Commonwealth of West Virginia; and I here resent any improper imputations sought now or heretofore by any man in or out of this Congress to impugn bad motives upon the part of these splendid men.

Very many of them do not agree with me in politics, but they are among the people of my State, and I am proud to be in position here to proclaim in this magnificent presence that they are of our best people.

This is my Government and my people's Government, and for any man to intimate there has been improper dealings between the Navy Department of this Government at any time and the men engaged in the coal industry in the Pocahontas region, or anywhere within the confines of West Virginia, I say again, I am here to resent it and proclaim to the world that there is no foundation in fact that will justify any such insinuation coming from any man. My people have the coal; they bought the land and own it; they have it for sale; their production is in the market. I am proud of them and proud of the coal we have in my State—apparently an inexhaustible amount of coal, oil, and gas—and if you people want to get rich and receive better treatment than you have ever received anywhere on this earth, come with your money into the hills of West Virginia, make your investments, take care of them as our people have, grow up with our State, and take pride in our State's institutions, and you will all lay by a competency for old age. We have churches, Sunday schools, schoolhouses, courthouses, and, above all, our people are the most generous and hospitable anywhere to be found on the American Continent. Climatic conditions are of the very best, and it is a fruitful field for investors to visit. We have no use for stragglers. When people come among us we want them to know that so long as they are law-abiding, liberty loving, and respect the rights of others, look after and take care of their own rights, we invite them to dwell with us.

Now, in this connection I submit for your consideration an analysis of the New River smokeless coal, to be found in my district, in a region of country traversed by the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, one of the very best railroad companies doing

business in the United States, and which analysis was finally completed on June 3, 1910:

Moisture	1.18
Fixed carbon	71.80
Volatile	22.54
Ash	4.48
	100.00
Sulphur	.89
B. T. U.	15.040
B. T. U. (dry basis)	15.220

Is it any wonder that the Government of the United States, and especially the Navy Department, is exceedingly anxious to have such coal? It does not leave clinkers in the furnaces, nor does it leave cinders; and while I do not desire to embarrass my friend from the State of Washington, nor would I say anything derogatory of the coal mined on the Pacific slope, but from what I understand from the analysis of that coal in history and the history thereof, and from what information I can get, I understand that it will produce heat and leaves the furnaces practically full of cinders and clinkers, requiring most of the time of the firemen to pull them out, and such a coal will burn out furnaces quicker than any other coal produced. There is much difference between cinders and clinkers and a soft white ash. The coal the Government is using from West Virginia, as it burns out leaves no clinkers, no cinders, and nothing but white ashes or dust.

This amendment ought to be defeated, and it will be defeated, because there are so many men in this Congress, every one of whom is an intelligent man, and I believe every one of whom is honestly inclined, a great majority of whom are men of affairs, business experience, and therefore broad minded; and they know that if it requires practically 2 tons of the western or Pacific slope coal to produce as much steam as 1 ton of the West Virginia coal will produce, and if there is from one to three dollars difference in the price of the coal per ton, every one of you men know that it is a money-saving proposition to this Government to continue the use of the West Virginia coal. The Secretary of the Navy wants it done, and insists that it shall be done. He does not want to cripple the Navy; he wants to get along as cheaply as he can and make the best record he can—that is, a record of economy—and when the information comes from that office that to continue the use of the West Virginia coal means a saving of, in round numbers, 45 per cent in the cost of the coal to the Government, I say to you that the patriotism of the men of this House, the moral desire to do right is such that this amendment can never pass this House.

I do from the bottom of my heart thank my Democratic friends all over the East of this country and from the Southland and those of you who reside in the Middle West for the very great interest you have taken in this matter. Let the vote come; let men show their colors; and when the final count is had this desperate amendment will be defeated.

I have no word of complaint against my brother Congressman from the State of Washington for waging the fight he has, as he is necessarily anxious to do what he can for the people of his western clime. And while it is true, as stated by him, this amendment has heretofore passed this Congress, I am here to-day to tell you that it has never been resisted until this contest began, nor have the facts relative to this important matter been placed before the American Congress until within the last few days.

If I have been instrumental in doing the Government a service in this matter, if I have been instrumental in saving the Government a vast amount of money, if I have been instrumental in properly presenting the cause of the business men of my State, defending the rights of the operators, and protecting the interests of the miners of my State, I am content and proud of the opportunity to do so. Let justice be done, it matters not where the chips fall. Let us look at this matter from a thoroughly business standpoint, from the standpoint of dollars and cents, and if you do I am sure the Government will not be harassed by the incorporation of this unmeritorious, if not deceptive, amendment to this important naval bill.

I have been carefully watching this amendment from the moment it was first introduced, nor have I lost a minute's time from this House while in session, as I was anxious in the discussion of this amendment to do this House a service and let the country know that the West Virginia coal operators are giving value received for every single penny they are receiving from the Government of the United States for their coal.

My friend from Washington has intimated that the Government is paying to my people \$6.50 a ton for the coal delivered along the coast of the Pacific slope. Nearly all of this money is absorbed by railroad companies and steamship companies which have to haul and float the coal to the market. They give employment to hundreds of railroad men and seamen. The fact is,

our operators are making very little profit on their coal. I wish they could make \$6.50 a ton profit and that it was economical upon the part of the Government to pay that price.

My friend has also intimated that 2,000,000 tons of the eastern coal per annum was being shipped to the Pacific slope. So far as I am individually concerned, I hope it all comes from West Virginia, as that would mean a trade to my people of at least \$12,000,000. I hope he is right in his assumption, and I wish it was \$112,000,000 that the coal operators in West Virginia were getting annually for their coal, and that the consumers of the coal could make use of it, as that would give employment to hundreds and thousands of idle men and give them fair prices for their labor and good conditions under which to labor.

I love to see and deal with broadgauged men. Let us demonstrate to the American people that we are broadgauged, capable of ignoring little things in life in order to accomplish the more important matters.

Mr. Chairman, let the vote come; we are ready. This Congress is ready, and as Representatives of the American people, they are for one time, at least, in dealing with this important subject, conscientiously prepared to act. Their verdict will be the verdict of the people; their judgment will be the judgment of the American people, and when it has been explained and they have acted, all will be well with my people.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be adopted. There is, in my opinion, no question but what it is in the interest of economy. There is no question but what in time of peace, and the provision applies only to times of peace, our Navy will be supplied with a fuel in every way as satisfactory as it is supplied by shipping the Pocahontas and other Chesapeake coals around the Horn. I have another reason for favoring this amendment. In my opinion, if the Navy had been using Pacific coast coals for the last three or four years we would have found much less difficulty in settling the question of opening the Alaskan coal fields. In my mind there is no question at all but what certain influences emanating from localities where the Chesapeake coals are mined and controlled have made it more difficult to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the Alaskan coal situation. So long as the Navy uses Chesapeake coals, so long as those industries and the carrying industries which carry the coal are interested in preventing the development of the Alaskan coal fields, so long it will be more difficult than it would be otherwise to open those fields to development; and if the Navy is compelled to use Pacific coast coals, we will have an added influence in favor of a reasonable development on the Pacific coast. There are coals on the Pacific coast that are just as satisfactory in every way for naval use as the Chesapeake coals, except that perhaps they do not contain quite as many steam units in the same space, but that is a matter of entire indifference except under the stress of war.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. Under the stress of war it is absolutely essential that we shall have the greatest number of steam units in a given cargo space, but that is a matter of entire indifference in times of peace. The land service and the tender service do not need the most intensely condensed fuel in the world for efficient use—

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. PADGETT. The statement I have here shows from official tests made that the western coals cost \$17 and for the same heat in eastern coals it costs \$8.50, and there is a difference of not less than 45 per cent.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has figures which, in the opinion of certain people, prove that.

Mr. PADGETT. No; that is the official test made by the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. MONDELL. I have investigated this question of steaming coals, I know something about it myself, and I do know—

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). That there have been many tests which show that there are Pacific-coast coals that have very nearly the same steaming efficiency as the Pocahontas coals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. And I am of the opinion that the amendment is in the interest of economy.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I think that if there is any place connected with the Government service

where they ought to put the soft pedal on monopoly it is in the case of the Pocahontas coal proposition and the Navy. They practically limit their purchase to that one company.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I will not yield. Of all the millions of tons of coal that they have sent to the Pacific Ocean, it all comes from the Pocahontas mine, so far as I know.

Mr. PADGETT. No; there are three of them.

Mr. BUTLER. Four companies.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Four companies.

Mr. BUTLER. There are four companies—the Pennsylvania, the Georges Creek, the New River, and Pocahontas.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. They never get any coal except right up here in our little part of the country. So far as monopolies are concerned, there are more than six different mines in the State of Washington that I know; there are several mines in British Columbia and one mine down in Oregon. Nobody wants to limit this coal to any particular State or mine. Now, to show you how unfair the gentleman's statement is, that the Pocahontas coal is 45 per cent better—and I have here a copy of the hearings before the Navy Department—that was only when they were running under forced draft; the Bureau of Mines says there is only 6 to 8 per cent difference in efficiency in the Washington coal and the Pocahontas.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman let me ask him a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will not, because the gentleman insisted on limiting the time. It makes a difference, because the Navy does not know how to use western coal and does not want to learn. And in that particular test to which the gentleman [Mr. PADGETT] refers, let me show you the unfairness of the proposition. They refused to take freshly mined coal, although those interested offered to furnish it to them without cost. I have here a copy of the hearings in which the man who represented the coal company, Mr. Huston, made the charge, in talking to the Secretary of the Navy, that the tests had not been fair, and he admitted it and said they would give him a further test.

Now, to show you the unfairness of that long recital that was just read, they ended up by saying it would take 725,000 tons of western coal per year. For what? For the entire fleet, not for the vessels that are on the Pacific Ocean. I want to say to this committee now that there is but one vessel out on the Pacific coast, except in the reserve fleet, and that is a third-class cruiser, and the reserve fleet has only a lot of old, secondhand, dilapidated, antiquated vessels, and the Navy Department wants you to think that they ought to have high-priced coal to run them at a high rate of speed up and down that coast in time of peace.

The truth about it is it is only a question of convenience, that is all, whether or not you are going to have a little more smoke and a little more coal. I want to ask again: Are you going to pay one or two million dollars a year in order that these men who are out on the Pacific coast, in time of peace, may have a coal that makes a little too much smoke? That is the whole question.

Now, this coal is good enough for the great merchant vessels that run on the Pacific. It is used by the Pacific Mail, which has among the finest vessels in the world, and it is used by the great Hill vessel, and it is used by the Revenue Cutter Service. It is used by the merchant vessels which run from that country to Europe—foreign vessels—it is good enough for everyone, in fact, except the Navy. But the Navy wants you to buy this high-priced coal, and pay from one to two million dollars a year extra for it, to be used on vessels that stay on Puget Sound or run up and down the coast to San Francisco. What is the use of running vessels in time of peace at a high rate of speed? The Navy experts even say the difference is not over 10 per cent in ordinary speed. As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] says, when you compel them to use this coal, they will learn how to get rid of the smoke. And let me again call your attention to this fact: That when we had that hearing at the department, Mr. Huston, representing one of the coal companies, said to the Secretary of the Navy, "In time of war you would be compelled to use Pacific coal. Do you not think you had better get accustomed to it in time of peace?" The Secretary of the Navy admitted that this was the most serious question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Division, Mr. Chairman. The committee divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 26, line 7, by adding at the end of the line the following proviso:

"Provided, That the coal purchased by the Government shall be mined by labor that is employed not exceeding eight hours a day."

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is not in order at this time.

Mr. PADGETT. I would like to have the amendment read again.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 6 for the purpose of offering a proviso by way of amendment; a proviso to the amendment which was adopted last Saturday, I believe.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. What page?

Mr. PADGETT. Page 6.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to the purport of the amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. I will state that the amendment that was adopted the other day repealed the provision passed in 1910, relative to bureau officers, and I have this amendment:

Provided, That no officer who has received his commission under the provision of said act shall be deprived of said commission or the rank, title, or emoluments thereof by virtue of this repeal.

That is the usual clause that is inserted to save the repealing clause.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment for information, without objection.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, at the end of the amendment, the following proviso:

"Provided, That no officer who has received his commission under the provisions of said act shall be deprived of said commission or the rank, title, or emoluments thereof by virtue of this repeal."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, while we are on that page, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman's motion would require unanimous consent.

Mr. HENSLEY. We are on that page now.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent was given only to return to this page for the purpose of offering the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to return to that page in order that the gentleman may offer the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Is that the same amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next unfinished amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, this disposes of all the matters that were passed over for consideration except the amendments relative to the eight-hour provisions. I am going to ask that they remain in abeyance until we take up the question of the eight-hour provisions under the "Increase of the Navy."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I want to suggest to the Chairman that perhaps he is in error in saying that we have disposed of all the amendments. If I am not mistaken, my colleague, Mr. MURRAY, from Boston, has an amendment which was passed over.

Mr. PADGETT. That is included.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is not an eight-hour provision.

Mr. PADGETT. That is connected with the labor question.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I do not want to imperil my colleague's rights.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no. Then suppose we return to page 59, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment pending.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PADGETT. Let me ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, was not the gentleman's amendment offered on page 59?

The CHAIRMAN. On page 45, as the Chair is informed.

Mr. MURRAY. I think it was on page 45, at the end of that portion of the bill in regard to the Bureau of Construction and Repair, at line 5, page 45.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 45, line 5, by striking out the period and inserting the following:

"Provided, That no part of any money appropriated in this act shall be used for construction or repair of vessels at navy yards or naval stations in the United States by enlisted men of the Navy."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the pending amendment an amendment which is to the same effect but which is phrased in language that is more satisfactory to the men who are affected in the navy yards by the provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] asks unanimous consent to substitute for his amendment the following.

Mr. PADGETT. Let the Clerk report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 45, line 5, after the word "dollars," insert the following: "Provided, That no part of the appropriations authorized by this act shall be expended for the pay of enlisted men or seamen, not including officers, while doing repair work belonging to any recognized trade on battleships or other vessels of the Navy when such battleships or vessels are docked or laid up at any navy yard for repairs. This provision shall not apply to such ordinary duties as are engaged in by the crew while at sea, except the dismantling and assembling of armament for the purpose of repairs."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the objection and also the point of order. It is clearly subject to a point of order, because it is not limited to this paragraph, but it says "this act."

Mr. MURRAY. I will withdraw it and offer it at a later place. As it relates to the same subject matter, however, I thought we might save time by offering it here.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the matter ought to come before the committee for settlement, I suggest that my colleague Mr. MURRAY be allowed to offer his amendment as a new paragraph, on page 63, line 6, just before the increase of the Navy.

Mr. MURRAY. I had in mind to offer it at page 65, line 6.

Mr. PADGETT. Then the gentleman will not have to ask unanimous consent for that.

Mr. MURRAY. I wanted to offer it now, so that we might clean up the whole matter.

Mr. PADGETT. We will take it up when we reach it.

Mr. MURRAY. Very well, then I withdraw the amendment at this time.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, we reach the question of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] relative to the battleships.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I should like to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MURRAY. Do I understand that the gentleman from Missouri has an amendment to my amendment or to the amendment of my colleague Mr. ROBERTS?

The CHAIRMAN. He offers his amendment to the amendment of the gentleman's colleague Mr. ROBERTS. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "two first-class battleships," and the word "each" wherever it occurs, and insert in lieu thereof the words "one first-class battleship."

Mr. PADGETT. Before we get to that, let me ask the gentleman [Mr. MURRAY] what became of the amendment he offered, for which he asked to substitute this other one, and then stated that he would bring it up on page 65. Do I understand that the gentleman withdraws the amendment on page 45 for the purpose of introducing the other one at page 65?

Mr. MURRAY. No, Mr. Chairman, I desire to have my rights on the original amendment that I offered on page 45.

Mr. PADGETT. Then we had better dispose of that.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. May I ask my colleague if he intends to offer both amendments?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; I want this one to this paragraph as to the Bureau of Construction and Repair. I would rather have this other one that I have in my hand, but I do not want to lose my opportunity to insist on both of them.

Mr. PADGETT. We have to come back anyway, so suppose we wait until we get to page 65.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. As I understand, if the later amendment of my colleague is adopted, his first amendment will not be necessary, and will not be pressed.

Mr. MURRAY. That is it. That is why I wanted first consideration of this subsequent one; but that was objected to.

Mr. PADGETT. We will consider it when we reach page 65.

Mr. MURRAY. I suppose we might reach an agreement—
Mr. PADGETT. It can be offered then. I do not want to make any agreement now, because it may be subject to a point of order.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not believe it is.

Mr. PADGETT. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] if we can arrive at an agreement, as to the debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I think so, Mr. Chairman. I do not know how many Members who favor battleships desire to speak at this time. I assume there will be several of them. Personally I do not propose to take much time, perhaps not over five minutes. What does the gentleman from Tennessee suggest as a reasonable time for this debate?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I suggest an equal division of time between those who desire one and two battleships, and no battleship.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know about that.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, it is not very clear what amendment is being referred to here. Is it the battleship proposition?

Mr. PADGETT. The battleship proposition.

Mr. BARTLETT. We have had a game of battledore and shuttlecock, and I wanted to find out what was pending.

Mr. PADGETT. It occurs to me that under the existing conditions an hour's debate on this question will be ample, 30 minutes on a side. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] some of my time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I would suggest 40 minutes on a side, in view of the magnitude of the proposition.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Can not the gentleman make it 30 minutes for each proposition?

Mr. PADGETT. Then those against all battleships would claim half of the time, because the one battleship is a battleship proposition. The one-ship men can get recognition with the two-ship men. I think one hour's debate will satisfy everyone.

Mr. CANNON. Of course, the bill will be read. This is general debate, I take it, that the gentleman is fixing the time for?

Mr. PADGETT. No; this is under the five-minute rule, and at the end of the hour debate will be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the power to move to close debate under the five-minute rule at any time, and, after all, that is the most valuable debate. If the gentlemen desire more than five minutes, I have no objection to the hour being divided as the gentleman suggests, but this is a large committee and it is a short paragraph. The gentleman from Tennessee, on the reading of the paragraph, can close debate at any time under the five-minute rule, if the majority desire.

Mr. PADGETT. I will state that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] and myself discussed the matter, and after looking over the field it occurred to us that with the information we had before us an hour would be sufficient time.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know that I shall want any time, and still I might want five minutes, and I apprehend that that is the case with many gentlemen on this side.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will state that we will proceed under the five-minute rule for the present, but gentlemen may expect that after about an hour there will be a motion to close debate if it is not arranged otherwise.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time since the second session of the Fifty-ninth Congress when the Naval Committee has reported a bill that did not carry battleships. During all that time the Naval Committee has consistently reported two battleships for each session of Congress, and each session of Congress has enacted into law a provision for two battleships. Now, however, we have before us a naval program that omits battleships entirely.

The program heretofore has not been one of increase of battleships of the American Navy; it has been a program to keep an effective fighting force of the size we then had. The additions of each year have not been for the purpose of building up an enormous Navy, but they have been made for the purpose of placing in commission effective fighting vessels to take the place of those becoming obsolete by reason of age or by reason of the rapid strides in naval architecture and the development of fighting vessels.

The effect of the program which has been carried on thus far has been to place the United States to-day second among the list of naval powers of the world, second in the amount of tonnage already constructed.

And while the United States has been carrying on this moderate and sensible program, some of the other nations of the earth have been carrying on a larger program, a more elaborate construction of ships, so that, when the ships already author-

ized by the United States are constructed and the ships that are authorized by other nations are constructed, the United States will drop to third place among the naval powers of the world.

But if at this session the Congress stops the program of building battleships, it immediately drops the United States not merely from second to third, but down into the fifth position among the naval powers of the world. Is that something the people of this country want to see done? The letters, petitions, and memorials that are being received by scores by Members of this body, and by the Committee on Naval Affairs, lead me to believe that the American people do not look upon such a policy with any degree of approval. If there is any one institution in this country of which the American people are proud it is their Navy; and they want to see it maintained on its present plane of efficiency. [Applause.]

And I say to our Democratic friends on the other side that if they imagine they are making a popular move by stopping this increase of our Navy and preventing the building of battleships to take the place of those that are becoming obsolete, they are making the greatest of mistakes, as they will learn later. The Navy of the United States appeals to the patriotism of the people.

There is no institution in this country more popular among the people than the Navy; and they want to see that Navy maintained as an efficient fighting unit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. ROBERTS. In spite of the action of the Democratic caucus on a recent occasion, I rise at this time as much a Democrat as any man in this Chamber to support that amendment. I said in that caucus that I believe the Democratic Party would make a grave and serious mistake if they adjourned this Congress without carrying out the pledge of the Denver platform—to enact such laws as would give the United States an adequate Navy.

I tried to point out to my colleagues in that caucus that with a Nation which has to-day the annual wealth of more than \$125,000,000,000, a restricted naval program that provided for no battleships at a time when the naval appropriation was \$125,000,000 was a short-sighted policy of national defense.

I have tried to show that, in spite of the arguments as to the expenditures against the Navy, the naval appropriation is about one-tenth of 1 per cent of the annual wealth of the American people. [Applause.]

It is a fundamental of the business management of to-day that insurance against risk and loss must be paid for and accounted as a fixed charge on the business. Men may try to get insurance on their lives and property at low rates, but in the last analysis they are pretty sure to get that insurance at any rate.

I believe that it is wise from the point of view of protecting the national wealth against possible loss from causes that seem now most unlikely to arise, but causes that may come upon us at a most unlikely time, to appropriate a comparatively small amount which well may be charged up to insurance. The total expenditure of \$125,000,000 a year for the Navy is a tax of 1 and a small fraction of 1 per cent of the total of capitalized industries in the country. Such an appropriation represents an actual per capita tax of about \$1.30, which is small indeed when it is compared with the per capita income of \$590. It is shown that the Spanish War cost the United States \$500,000,000. We had a Navy in that war that was splendidly efficient [applause]; but if we had had a Navy that included then four more *Oregons* than the one we did have, it is certain there would have been no war. [Applause.] The cost of these additional ships would have been, to be sure, approximately \$30,000,000. An investment, therefore, of 6 per cent of the money the war cost would have saved half a billion of dollars and hundreds of lives. [Applause.]

I said a few moments ago to one of my very good friends, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Judge ADAMSON, of Georgia, that I was in favor of two battleships. He asked me if I was in favor of a navy to comprise 100 battleships. Of course, I am not and so I told him. The judge wondered what I believed an adequate navy to be, and I am glad that he asked me the question.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is wise to quote from the remarks of the gentleman whose duty it is in this connection to advise this legislative body. I refer to the head of the great Navy Department, and I find at page 36 of the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy an expression of what may be accepted as an adequate American Navy. That statement gives not only the opinion of the Secretary himself, but also the consensus of opinion of the best men in the Navy and out of

it who have given consideration to this subject. You may readily see by an examination of the accompanying tables the sea strength of the navies of the world as of December 1, 1911.

SEA STRENGTH.

Tables showing the relative strength of the Navy and its importance in comparison with foreign navies December 1, 1911. Vessels undergoing trials are considered as completed. The following vessels are not included in the tables: Those over 20 years old, unless they have been reconstructed and rearmed since 1905; transports, colliers, repair ships, converted merchant vessels, or any other auxiliaries; vessels of less than 1,000 tons, except torpedo craft; torpedo craft of less than 50 tons.

Vessels built.

	Battleships, Dreadnought type. ¹	Battleships. ²	Armored cruisers, invincible type. ³	Armored cruisers. ⁴	Cruisers. ⁵	Destroyers.	Torpedo boats.	Submarines.	Coast-defense vessels. ⁶
England.....	12	42	5	34	79	192	59	65
Germany.....	7	21	2	9	39	109	22	14	5
United States.....	6	25	12	30	36	28	20	4
France.....	20	22	10	72	200	66	2
Japan.....	13	2	11	15	58	59	10	2
Russia.....	9	6	11	95	29	31	2
Italy.....	8	10	6	22	46	9
Austria.....	6	3	6	14	43	6	6

- ¹ Battleships having a main battery of all big guns (11 inches or more in caliber).
- ² Battleships, first class, are those of (about) 10,000 tons or more displacement.
- ³ Armored cruisers having guns of largest caliber in main battery and capable of taking their place in line of battle with the battleships. They have an increase of speed at the expense of carrying fewer guns in main battery and a decrease in armor protection; also called battleship cruisers.
- ⁴ Includes all unarmored cruising vessels above 1,000 tons displacement.
- ⁵ Includes smaller battleships and monitors. No more vessels of this class are being proposed or built by the great powers.
- ⁶ Includes vessels of colonies.

Vessels building or authorized.

[Includes vessels authorized, but not yet laid down, as well as those actually under construction.]

	Battleships, Dreadnought type.	Battleships.	Armored cruisers, invincible type.	Armored cruisers.	Cruisers.	Destroyers.	Torpedo boats.	Submarines.
England ¹	10	5	10	31	17
Germany ²	9	3	6	12	10
United States.....	6	1	14	18
France.....	4	13	15
Japan ³	3	4	3	2	3
Russia.....	7	13	8
Italy.....	4	3	10	46	11
Austria.....	4	3	6	12	6

- ¹ England has no continuing shipbuilding policy, but usually lays down each year 5 armored ships with a proportional number of smaller vessels.
- ² Includes vessels of colonies.
- ³ Germany has a continuing shipbuilding program, governed by a fleet law authorized by the Reichstag. For 1912 there are authorized 1 battleship, 1 armored cruiser 2 cruisers, 12 destroyers; eventual strength to consist of 38 battleships, 20 armored cruisers, 38 cruisers, 144 destroyers.
- ⁴ \$3,570,000 authorized for experiments and further construction.
- ⁵ \$78,837,591 authorized to be expended from 1911 to 1917 for the construction of war vessels.

Personnel.

Rank.	England.	France.	Germany.	Japan.	United States.
Admirals of the fleet.....	4	2	1	(¹)
Admirals.....	12	5	7
Vice admirals.....	22	15	12	20
Rear admirals.....	55	30	22	38	30
Captains and commanders.....	636	340	302	296	212
Other line officers.....	2,274	1,509	1,596	1,710	1,114
Midshipmen at sea.....	606	61	398	154	287
Engineer officers.....	940	505	433	695
Medical officers.....	593	413	286	358	348
Pay officers.....	697	216	236	324	202
Chaplains.....	138	24
Warrant officers.....	2,494	2,850	2,512	1,520	645
Enlisted men.....	105,434	53,316	50,380	42,043	47,500
Marine officers.....	425	109	354
Enlisted men (marines).....	619,635	74,672	9,521
Total.....	133,965	58,755	60,974	47,167	60,217

- ¹ The Admiral of the Navy.
- ² The United States now has, temporarily, as extra numbers, due to promotion for war service, and to officers restricted by law to engineering duty only on shore only, 12 flag officers, 26 captains, 4 commanders, 11 lieutenant commanders, and 1 lieutenant.
- ³ Includes pharmacists and apothecaries.
- ⁴ Includes pharmaceutical officers.
- ⁵ Includes adjutants, premier matres, and matres of all branches.
- ⁶ Includes 3,100 men of the Coast Guard.
- ⁷ Marine Infantry and Seaman Artillery.

This table shows that the United States is now second among the navies of the world, but that it will drop to third when vessels now building, or authorized by various countries, shall have been completed.

I invite your attention also to this table which shows the warship tonnage of the principal naval powers as of December 1, 1911:

WARSHIP TONNAGE OF THE PRINCIPAL NAVAL POWERS.

Number and displacement of warships, built and building, of 1,000 or more tons, and of torpedo craft of more than 50 tons, Dec. 1, 1911.

[Vessels undergoing trials are considered as completed. The following vessels are not included in the tables: Those over 20 years old, unless they have been reconstructed and rearmament since 1905; those not actually begun or ordered, although authorized; transports, colliers, repair ships, torpedo depot ships, converted merchant vessels, or yachts; vessels of less than 1,000 tons, except torpedo craft; torpedo craft of less than 50 tons.]

Type of vessel.	Great Britain.				Germany.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
Battleships ¹ (Dreadnought type)	12	236,350	10	247,000	7	141,720	9	217,400
Battleships, first class ²	42	617,500			21	252,712		
Coast-defense vessels ³					5	20,273		
Armored cruisers ⁴ (Invincible type)	5	96,850	4	90,800	2	41,637	3	72,650
Armored cruisers	34	406,800			9	94,245		
Cruisers above 6,000 tons ⁵	14	140,500						
Cruisers, 6,000 to 3,000 tons ⁶	42	200,460	10	50,040	24	98,180	6	32,650
Cruisers, 3,000 to 1,000 tons ⁶	23	49,540			15	34,528		
Torpedo-boat destroyers	192	108,703	31	26,980	109	58,474	12	9,000
Torpedo boats	59	12,710			22	3,700		
Submarines	65	20,736	17	13,610	14	4,140	10	6,000
Total tons built and total tons building	1,896,140		428,430		749,609		337,700	
Total tons built and building	2,324,579				1,087,309			

Type of vessel.	United States.				France.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
Battleships ¹ (Dreadnought type)	6	115,650	4	105,600			4	92,308
Battleships, first class ²	25	334,140			20	280,005		
Coast-defense vessels ³	4	12,900			2	15,400		
Armored cruisers ⁴ (Invincible type)								
Armored cruisers	12	157,445			22	211,070		
Cruisers above 6,000 tons ⁵	5	43,800			3	24,022		
Cruisers, 6,000 to 3,000 tons ⁶	14	49,541			5	21,280		
Cruisers, 3,000 to 1,000 tons ⁶	11	13,631			2	4,706		
Torpedo-boat destroyers	36	21,306	14	12,550	72	26,782	13	9,170
Torpedo boats	28	4,802			200	19,106		
Submarines	20	4,490	18	8,805	66	22,304	15	9,182
Total tons built and total tons building	757,711		127,355		630,705		110,720	
Total tons built and building	885,066				741,425			

¹ Battleships having a main battery of all big guns (11 inches or more in caliber).
² Battleships, first class, are those of (about) 10,000 or more tons displacement.
³ Includes smaller battleships and monitors.
⁴ Armored cruisers having guns of largest caliber in main battery and capable of taking their place in line of battle with the battleships. They have an increase of speed at the expense of carrying fewer guns in main battery and a decrease in armor protection. Are also called battleship cruisers.
⁵ Colonial vessels included.
⁶ All unarmored warships of more than 1,000 tons are, in this table, classed according to displacement as cruisers. Scouts are considered as cruisers in which battery and protection have been sacrificed to secure extreme speed. The word "protected" has been omitted because all cruisers except the smallest and oldest now have protective decks.

Number and displacement of warships, built and building, etc.—Contd.

Type of vessel.	Japan.				Russia.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
Battleships ¹ (Dreadnought type)			2	41,600			7	153,000
Battleships, first class ²	13	191,698			9	122,250		
Coast-defense vessels ³	2	9,086			2	10,380		
Armored cruisers ⁴ (Invincible type)	2	29,200	4	110,000				
Armored cruisers	11	108,900			6	63,599		
Cruisers above 6,000 tons ⁵	2	13,130			7	46,430		
Cruisers, 6,000 to 3,000 tons ⁶	8	30,303	3	15,000	2	6,385		
Cruisers, 3,000 to 1,000 tons ⁶	5	9,158			2	2,680		
Torpedo-boat destroyers	58	22,608	2	1,200	95	35,794	13	13,230
Torpedo boats	69	5,500			29	3,722		
Submarines	10	1,726	3	950	31	6,648	8	4,800
Total tons built and total tons building	421,309		168,750		297,819		176,000	
Total tons built and building	590,119				473,879			

Type of vessel.	Italy.				Austria.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
Battleships ¹ (Dreadnought type)			4	85,020			4	80,000
Battleships, first class ²	8	95,700			6	74,613		
Coast-defense vessels ³					6	41,700		
Armored cruisers ⁴ (Invincible type)								
Armored cruisers	10	78,520			3	18,800		
Cruisers above 6,000 tons ⁵								
Cruisers, 6,000 to 3,000 tons ⁶			3	9,070	3	11,453	3	10,449
Cruisers, 3,000 to 1,000 tons ⁶	6	12,470			3	7,650		
Torpedo-boat destroyers	22	7,587	10	6,130	14	5,702	6	4,800
Torpedo boats	46	7,713	28	3,390	43	6,899	12	2,400
Submarines	9	1,822	11	3,500	6	1,686	6	1,800
Total tons built and total tons building	203,812		108,310		167,993		99,440	
Total tons built and building	312,122				267,442			

¹ Battleships having a main battery of all big guns (11 inches or more in caliber).
² Battleships, first class, are those of (about) 10,000 or more tons displacement.
³ Includes smaller battleships and monitors.
⁴ Armored cruisers having guns of largest caliber in main battery and capable of taking their place in line of battle with the battleships. They have an increase of speed at the expense of carrying fewer guns in main battery and a decrease in armor protection. Are also called battleship cruisers.
⁵ Colonial vessels included.
⁶ All unarmored warships of more than 1,000 tons are, in this table, classed according to displacement as cruisers. Scouts are considered as cruisers in which battery and protection have been sacrificed to secure extreme speed. The word "protected" has been omitted because all cruisers except the smallest and oldest now have protective decks.

Relative order of warship tonnage.

Present order (tonnage completed).		As would be the case were vessels building now completed.	
Nation.	Tonnage.	Nation.	Tonnage.
Great Britain	1,896,140	Great Britain	2,324,579
United States	757,711	Germany	1,087,309
Germany	749,609	United States	885,066
France	630,705	France	741,425
Japan	421,309	Japan	590,119
Russia	297,819	Russia	473,879
Italy	203,812	Italy	312,122
Austria	167,993	Austria	267,442

Now, we do not propose to rival England and Germany and Japan in the matter of a building program for the Navy. But we do believe that the annual appropriation should be such that it will provide for the future of our Nation a fleet of at least 20 ships in the first line and 20 ships in the second line of the Navy. The present strength of the Navy is 37 battleships, of which 28 may be considered as worthy of a place in the first line and the remaining 9 as second-line ships. Sixteen of those 28 are pre-Drednaughts and their qualifications of the first line is indeed doubtful; certainly three years from now they can not be so qualified, and the first fleet has been reduced to 12 ships—new ships are added to it. Four of the nine ships classed now in the second line will reach the limit of the recognized life of a battleship in 1915-16. They must be removed, therefore, from the second fleet and relegated to the line of harbor defenses.

The ships that we may provide for at this time can not be ready for at least three years, and we must legislate at this time with the thought in mind as to what the condition of our Navy may be in the year 1915-16.

There is a splendid page of our American history that tells the story of how Perry and his men on Lake Erie in the War of 1812 hastily built a navy and with it swept England from the seas. It is only matched by that page of American history which shows that with undaunted courage the "embattled farmer" stood in Massachusetts and in other places and made a great fight for constitutional Government for equality and liberty. [Applause.]

That courage can be exemplified at any time by American soldiers and sailors; but present-day conditions are such that a navy can not be hastily put together. If we permit this Congress and future Congresses to go by without making the appropriations necessary to maintain an adequate navy, the time may come, and I for one am afraid that it will come, when we shall wish that we had made this appropriation.

I listened with great interest the other day to my colleague from Massachusetts, Judge HARRIS, as he told of the great work that his illustrious father did as his share in contributing to the building of the original American Navy. I felt a reasonable and just pride as I listened to his recital of that story, and I shall never forget his recital of what that father said to him when he brought to him the news of Dewey's victory at Manila. "Well, boy," said the father, "it seems now after many years that eight years of hard work and strife has finally been of some service to the country." I wonder whether or not it will ever again be necessary to repeat the victory of Manila Bay. If such a necessity does arise, the economy of to-day will be looked upon as a foolhardy policy, in view of any such contingency, and it is because I feel this way that I am pledged to step out of the ranks of my Democratic colleagues and to urge this House to support the amendment of my colleague, Mr. ROBERTS, even though it comes from a Republican member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I protest that this bill is not a political measure. I protest that when it comes to the matter of the American Navy we should not be Republicans, Democrats, nor partisans of any class, but we should give to the consideration of the matter the best opinion and political judgment that we can, in order that there may be a true and right solution of the great problem that confronts us. [Applause.]

It has been only 14 years since the Spanish War, and we all remember the great work the battleship *Oregon* did when she made her great triumphant world tour from Manila to Santiago. We all know what splendid work that ship did at that time, and it is hard for some to realize that the time has come when the *Oregon* must be retired from the first line of fighting ships in the Navy; but the fact is, as is contained in the Secretary's report and as given to us by the Navy experts of the country, that not only the *Oregon*, but the *Indiana*, the *Iowa*, the *Massachusetts* must soon be retired from the first line. We are not asking to do anything more than to maintain the Navy at its present standard of efficiency when we ask to have the resolution for two battleships appropriated.

Now, I have no fears of the danger of war. I have no thoughts of impending disaster; but I want to help in every way that I may to maintain an adequate Navy, particularly at this time when the Panama Canal, at an expenditure of \$400,000,000 of American money, is about to be completed. I want our Navy to be of such strength that it may be able to maintain its high place among the navies of the world. And in urging this thought upon this House I am trying to reflect the sentiment of that great water-front district in the city of Boston that has honored me by sending me as its Representative to this House.

If you believe that this is a sectional question, however, let me call your attention to the editorial comments of the newspapers of the country, regardless of their political affiliations,

on the days just after the caucus that we Democrats had on this matter of a building program for the Navy. If you believe that this is a sectional question, let me assure you that men who have campaigned throughout our country bear testimony to the fact that mere mention of the glorious work of the American Navy always touches a responsive chord in the breasts of the American citizens. I hope, therefore, that, regardless of party and regardless of the section of the country from which they may come, a sufficient number of the Members of this House may support this amendment for two battleships to insure an appropriation by this House. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, during the general debate I took occasion to say that the battleship question does not cause the usual excitement this year. The reason probably is that everyone knows what the final disposition of the question will be. The Democratic majority of the House will vote for no battleships. The Senate will insist on at least one, and the House will finally yield to a program so wisely limited in order to keep the Navy at its present state of efficiency. [Applause.] I have consistently voted for the last 8 or 10 years for one battleship. Way down deep in my heart I am frank to say that I am for no battleships. [Applause.] I do not think we would incur any risk whatsoever if none were provided this year. But so it may not be said that those of us who are favoring arbitration are willing to go to the extent of denying to the country such means of defense as seem, unfortunately, still necessary, under present conditions I am willing to vote for one, which means a vote not for an increase of the Navy, but for the maintenance of the Navy at its present strength. No matter what position a man may take on the question of battleships, there may be and are great differences among us, but there is no difference as to one paramount proposition, and that is we are all in favor of the absolute security of our country. [Applause.] Now, that security might be achieved in two different ways. It might be achieved according to the old system, which unfortunately is still in vogue, of building battleship after battleship and thereby taxing the resources of all the nations to their utmost.

Or it might be done in the same way that civilized nations are now guarding their domestic peace, namely, by law, or, speaking in an international sense, by the perfection of the necessary legal machinery to adjust and settle international difficulties in a peaceful way. And along this line I wish to call the attention of the Members to the fact that this legal machinery is no longer a mere dream of theorists, inasmuch as The Hague conferences, the first as well as the second, have unanimously agreed upon the creation of a high court of nations, which is to decide all questions of an international character that might be brought before it. That high court of nations was established in 1899 at the first Hague conference. At the second conference the court was perfected. In order to secure a real judicial tribunal The Hague conference agreed on a court of arbitral justice, and the motion to establish such was carried unanimously by all the nations represented at that conference—44 in number. Only the mooted question of how the judges should be distributed among the different nations and how many judges should be appointed is the cause of its not having been put in execution so far. But all signs point to the probability that at the next Hague conference in 1915 that court will be established.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And in connection with that court, the nations will agree on general arbitration treaties such as have been proposed by President Taft recently. We are going to have them in spite of the Senate of the United States, because the time is very close at hand when that great body will have to do the bidding of the will of the American people regarding this great question. And after we have arbitration treaties with all great powers these powers among themselves will negotiate similar ones, so that the civilized world will be one great net of arbitration treaties. And the next question will be a code of international law to be sanctioned by all the parliaments and to be applied in all cases that may be brought before that court.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a substitute for your battleships, more humane and much more economical and much more in accordance with modern civilization than your method of force. And that substitute, I hope, will be supported even by those who are now supporting the policy of battleships. I think we

ought to all join hands if we can for a substitute such as that which will relieve the people of this country and other countries of a well-nigh unbearable burden of taxation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KONIG, Mr. SAUNDERS, and Mr. TURNBULL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TURNBULL] is recognized.

Mr. TURNBULL. Mr. Chairman, if I had been given the power to fix the battleship program in the bill under consideration, I think I should have included therein one battleship or one fast armored cruiser, as that has been the policy heretofore advocated by the Democrats. But when a majority of my colleagues on this side of the House, after due consideration, determined otherwise, I abided by the decision, as I always expect to do.

I am a highland man, if I may use that expression, and prior to becoming a member of the Naval Committee had given very little attention to the character of the ships to be built or of the needs of our Navy along that line. I am in favor of having a Navy sufficient to protect our rapidly increasing foreign commerce, to protect our seacoasts in time of war, and to give assurance of protection to our citizens in whatever country they may desire to do business. I attended the naval review in New York in October, 1911, and was justly proud of our 7-mile line of battleships exhibited on that occasion, and I am doubly proud of the officers in command and of the men behind the guns, for I believe the same spirit now exists among those men that animated and permeated the hearts of the brave men who manned our ships and helped so materially in giving life to our Nation and liberty to our people in the beginning. I am satisfied that as a fighting force they have no equal in any of the nations of the earth. [Applause.]

Since I have become a member of the Naval Committee I have studied the subject of the needs of our Navy in every way I possibly could, and have listened carefully to the testimony taken before the committee on the subject, and the more I try to study and consider the question from a common-sense business standpoint the more I doubt the expediency or wisdom of the construction of any more battleships of the *Dreadnought* type, such as those we are now building or have already in commission.

Let us look at the history of and effect of this battleship building. When the *Merrimac* and the *Monitor* had the engagement in Hampton Roads, our ships were wooden vessels and our guns were smooth bore and of short range. When we began to armor plate the ships, we began to improve the type of the guns, and they were changed from smooth bores to rifles. As the thickness of the armor plate was increased, the size and length of the guns were increased. As the size of the guns was increased of course the size, character, and destructiveness of the projectiles were increased.

We invented the torpedo, which is a projectile loaded with high explosives that are fired out of tubes, and when started they propel themselves, and it is admitted that when one of these strikes one of our *Dreadnoughts* it ends the life of the ship, it matters not what is the thickness of the armor plate. Then the submarine boats were invented so that they can travel under water and fire these torpedoes with the same accuracy, almost, as if they were upon the surface of the water. This necessitated the building of torpedo-boat destroyers to try and prevent the deadly effect of the torpedo boats, and now it is claimed that each one of these *Dreadnoughts* should have to protect it five torpedo boats and two destroyers. In addition to what I have stated, a torpedo shell has been invented that can be fired out of the same guns as the steel projectiles with nearly the same range, and it is admitted that if one of these shells strikes the ship or strikes and explodes in the water within from 40 to 100 feet of the ship that it will destroy it.

Now, then, what do we deduce from this state of facts? We build a battleship of the *Dreadnought* type that costs not less than \$12,000,000, armored with the heaviest armor plate and equipped with the best guns known, and this ship can be destroyed, first, by a steel projectile fired out of a 14-inch rifle, which it is claimed will pierce the armor and destroy the ship certainly at a distance of 10,000 yards; second, by a torpedo fired out of a torpedo tube; third, by a torpedo shell fired out of a 14-inch gun; fourth, by a mine that may be put in any harbor.

When I consider these facts, I ask myself the question, What good is the armor if the projectile will pierce it? What superior advantage does a large ship have over a smaller one if it can be sunk by a torpedo, torpedo shell, or mine as readily as a smaller ship? We all know, whether we have any common sense or not, that a large ship can be hit more readily than a smaller one. If what I have said is true, the fighting capacity

of our ships has not advanced one inch beyond the ships in which Decatur and Perry won their victories. These large ships are of slow speed and can travel only in very deep water. The ships do not do the fighting, but it is done by the men with the guns, and I can not help but feel that three ships built at the same cost that one of these big ships costs now, and with a greater rate of speed and manned by the same men and with the same character of guns will be more effective than the one big ship. This is certainly true if there is anything in the tactics of the great generals that the way to win a battle is to get there first with the most men.

In my judgment we are putting too many eggs in one basket. We are expending our revenues faster than we gather them in. Think of the great expense and ask yourself the question, Where are we drifting? We are simply aping foreign nations, with no fixed policy of our own. Have we made any progress? Yes; but principally in the facility with which we spend the people's money, wrung from them, it is claimed, by unjust taxation; for the cost of the Navy has increased in the last 20 years from about thirty millions to one hundred and thirty millions of dollars. It is easy to expand, but it is hard to contract, and it looks as if we are using greater efforts to find new subjects of taxation than we are to reduce the burdens now resting upon us.

Mr. Chairman, there is great unrest among the people all over the country. It looks as if the wealth of the country continues to accumulate in the hands of a few, and the burdens of the people who do the work and receive the wages are becoming greater as the days go by. If we would win battles in the future we must so act as to keep the men behind the guns contented and happy. Let the people at home become discontented and poverty stricken, and then patriotism and love of country will vanish and the big ships and the big guns will become useless. [Applause.]

Mr. KONIG. Mr. Chairman, it will take me but a few minutes to express my views on the subject now under discussion. I am a Democrat, and a party man at that, and, thank God, since I have been a Member of this House I have never had to vote against my party organization. The question of the size of the American Navy is not now and never has been a party question; and, moreover, whatever the caucus may have done in respect to this bill, I am not bound by it, for I remained away from the caucus.

Just exactly how many battleships or how many cruisers or how many torpedo boats we have, I confess I do not know as well, perhaps, as I ought to, and I also confess I do not know just exactly how our Navy compares in strength with that of France or of England or of Germany. But I do know, Mr. Chairman, that there are other navies far larger and far better equipped than ours. And I also know, Mr. Chairman, that the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy have urged Congress to make an appropriation for two additional battleships. These officials are in the possession of the information that makes them experts; and in any event I would rather follow their judgment and be guilty of an extravagance than to refuse to follow it and suffer the disastrous consequences that must attend upon a false economy in so important a matter as the strength of our Navy.

The American Nation, whether wisely or unwisely, has become a world power; our interests are no longer confined to the North American Continent. We have become an empire, with possessions in all corners of the world; we have those gold bricks within the shadow of the shores of Japan—the Philippine Islands; we have Hawaii to watch over, and also Porto Rico, and we must not forget our foster child, Cuba. The Panama Canal represents an investment of hundreds of millions of dollars and the best engineering genius of all time. If the American flag is ever to come down in any of these possessions or dependencies, it must come down of our own freely given consent. We can not let ourselves be put in the position where we may be forced to lower the flag.

These considerations and the consideration that a fellow who can take care of himself seldom has to fight compel me as a lover of peace to vote for the building of additional battleships. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL and Mr. MARTIN of Colorado rose.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I do not care about shutting off that side altogether. I am willing to follow the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado. I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] for one battleship. [Applause.] And I shall support it with some reservation, because, as a matter of fact, I had fully made up my mind not to vote for any battleships this year. It is not often that that side of the House does a really good thing, but I think they

did a very excellent thing when the caucus decided against battleships, not that I think the caucus decision will stand as a final decision of the Congress, because I think that ultimately we shall provide for one battleship. But I think it was a most excellent thing to challenge the attention of the country to the mad race of the world in competition in the building of enormous and costly ships of war, ships of a character that never have been tried out in actual warfare, and ships that, at the very best we can hope for them, will within a decade be useless and valueless. England, Germany, and France, and to a lesser extent Japan and Russia, each feels it can not afford to be too far distanced in this race for military preparedness.

We are the only nation in the world that can safely halt our naval program, for there is not a man under the flag who knows his country and understands the condition of the world that has the slightest notion that there would be any danger whatever to our country, its honor, or its people if we did not build a battleship in the next 20 years. [Applause.] Not that I believe we should wholly neglect this arm of defense. On the contrary, I have always believed that we should adopt and steadily maintain a decent and reasonable naval program, that we should have such a Navy as will form a reasonable first line of defense in the very improbable event of a great war.

We are in a position now to do the world a mighty service in calling to the attention of the civilized world the fact that we are not being carried away by this naval madness that seems now to control all the courts of Europe and the Orient—a naval madness that is well-nigh rushing into bankruptcy the greatest nations of the world. Let us stop and think how rapidly these naval expenditures have been increasing, the world over, in the past few years, and how certainly they must lead to the bankruptcy of the nations if they are to be continued in the same ratio for a few years longer. There must be a halt in this tremendous increase of naval armaments, and we are in such a position that we can show all the world that we are not carried away by this desire to have more and larger ships than any other nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I am not one of those who look for the speedy coming of the millennium. I am not one of those who believe that wars will ever wholly cease. But I am one of those who look forward with hopeful anticipation toward the day when most of the differences between the nations shall be settled by courts of arbitration. I think we have seen more than the dawning of that day. I think we are well within it, and I sincerely hope that generations will pass before there shall be another great war among the great civilized nations of the world. And if we are not to have wars constantly recurring, then it is the duty of every citizen of every civilized country to use the influence he has, be it great or small, in the checking of the wasteful expenditures for war-like purposes. [Applause.]

How much the world might do, what benefits might be brought to the human race, what splendid monuments of peace could be erected, if we expended the money we are now expending for these huge leviathans of the deep for works that would benefit mankind, instead of joining in a mad race to prepare the biggest ships and the most ships with which to blow men off the earth and out of the water. If we could use the same sums of money in the great undertakings of peace, and if we could retain in the paths of useful productiveness the men whose lives are now wasted in warlike pursuits, how much better it would be for all the world.

We can not, of course, disarm. We must maintain a fair Army and a fair Navy. We must maintain a Navy in keeping with our great wealth and power and position in the world. But we should not endeavor to make a display of our power by building battleships as some people make display of wealth by wearing costly jewels. The one is as undesirable as the other. Our place in the world and our influence and strength in war and peace depend infinitely more upon our 90,000,000 of intelligent citizenship than upon all of the bayonets in the country and all the guns we will ever mount on battleships. [Applause.]

If we would turn our attention to and spend the money now wasted in these great armaments, upon works that would be helpful to all mankind, all the world would rise up and call us blessed. Let us not allow our Navy to be reduced to a point where we shall not have a Navy in keeping with our power and wealth and our influence in the world. One ship a year is

quite sufficient to maintain an adequate Navy in this country, and if we adopt a one-battleship program we shall have given notice to all the world that we do not propose to join or participate in this unwise, wasteful, and wicked race for enormous armaments, taxing the people for their construction and their upbuilding. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW] may be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, that this is not a political question, at least that it is not properly a party question, is strikingly illustrated by the fact that the Republican Member from Wyoming approves and the Democratic Member from Colorado disapproves of the battleship program, or rather the no-battleship program, which has been adopted on this side of the House.

Right at the outset of his remarks the gentleman [Mr. MONDELL] stated a fact which strongly inclines me in favor of continuing, for the present at least, our present battleship program, and that is what he referred to as the mad race of the other powers of the world to build up great navies. I want to ask the gentleman from Wyoming if he thinks this great Nation, with its tremendous responsibilities as a world power, can afford to sit idly by and see the peace of the world—yea, even the map of the world—threatened by the building up of these great navies, and yet this Nation not place itself in a position to protect the peace of the world.

Mr. MONDELL. Is that a question?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. That is not a question. At least it ought not to be a question. If it is a question, it is one that ought to answer itself. It is a question that ought to point to the undoubted duty of this Nation to place itself in a position where, if necessary, it would be able to assert itself in favor of the peace of the world. One day during this session our Socialist brother, the gentleman from Milwaukee [Mr. BERGER] made what I thought was a very pat and apt suggestion, and that was that neutrality is a good thing if only you are able to enforce it.

Mr. Chairman, I subscribe most heartily to that proposition. I was one of the thirty-odd Members on this side of the House who voted for two battleships in each of the two naval appropriation bills in the Sixty-first Congress, and I regret very much that the pending naval appropriation bill does not make similar provision. [Applause.]

While I represent the State which above all others in the Union is secure from foreign attack or invasion, I take some pride in the fact that I am as much in favor of an adequate Navy as any Member of this body who represents a seacoast district. I take some pride in the fact that I am a big-Navy Democrat; not a big Navy as a threat and menace against the peace of the world, but a big Navy as a guaranty of the peace of the world; and that I understand and believe to be, in this time of striving for naval supremacy, the true need and the highest mission of an adequate American Navy.

As I have listened to the objections of gentlemen to continuing for a time longer, at least, our present naval program, it has seemed to me that they looked at this question, both in its larger and in its smaller aspects, with an entirely too limited vision. It seems to me, as I have listened to some gentlemen, that the chief question at issue is whether the Navy is built up around battleships or coal barges. Which is the unit of a navy? I have never heard that a naval engagement ever turned upon the auxiliaries. I have never heard that a naval engagement hinged upon transports and colliers, or even submarines and destroyers. In the great decisive naval battle between China and Japan, in the decisive battle between Japan and Russia, and in the two great naval battles between the United States and Spain, I did not hear anything about auxiliaries. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. There is no use asking for five minutes more. A man could not undertake to discuss this subject in five minutes. I will ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear about auxiliaries in the China Sea, or the Japan Sea, or Manila Bay, or Santiago, or even in the present war between Italy and Turkey. I did not read about any auxiliary fleet convoying and supporting the *Oregon* in its great historic cruise around the Horn. I do not understand such a fleet could make such a cruise. But I do not say that all these auxiliaries are not necessary to the naval power which would keep abreast of

the naval equipment of other countries. I simply say that these factors, in which the American Navy is said to be deficient, are minor. As for transports and colliers, we have 300 vessels in the coastwise trade which could be seized and impressed into the defense of the country should occasion require.

But it is objected that the Navy is badly balanced because of the disparity between fighting ships and auxiliaries. A more practical and analytical way of stating the proposition would be to ask whether we have too many battleships or too few auxiliaries. If we had sufficient auxiliaries for the present number of battleships, would the Navy be too large? If no, then we should continue the present rate of increase in battleships, thus maintaining our front while bringing up our rear. If yes, then we ought to reasonably curtail the battleship program, not stop it altogether. It is all right to balance the Navy, but it is a matter of vital importance whether it is balanced up or down.

But it is further argued that our ships become quickly obsolete. My reply to this is twofold. First, they do not become obsolete any more quickly than the vessels of other nations; and second, the same objection would apply with even more force to such novel factors in naval warfare as submarines and torpedo-boat destroyers. If, as has been argued by gentlemen on this side of the House, we are to await the development of the best type of battleship, then let us await the development of the best type of submarine and destroyer. What is the use of building a lot of submarines and destroyers that may be obsolete to-morrow? And how will we know the best type when it comes? The truth is, to state these objections is to answer them. They are so feeble they fall of their own weight.

The same may be said of the proposition that we want a defensive, not an aggressive, Navy. I confess, perhaps because it is that I am so dense, that I can no more distinguish between a defensive and an aggressive navy than I can between good trusts and bad trusts. According to my way of reasoning, a navy is either adequate or inadequate, measured by the power and the responsibility of the nation.

I can conceive of no other practicable test. This is one case where, in my judgment, a half loaf is not better than no bread. A weak Navy would provoke, not prevent, trouble. Either we should have and maintain a first-class Navy or none. It takes two years to build a modern fighting ship and so long to build a modern Navy that you must keep building. When you want a Navy you want it badly and at once. One naval battle decided the war between China and Japan, one naval battle decided the war between Russia and Japan, two naval battles decided the war between the United States and Spain. In these four engagements, three navies were destroyed and their countries humbled and driven from power for decades; and unless the human race has suddenly lost the instinct of the ages, other powers will meet the same fate. Members of this House participated in the greatest civil war of all history. Since then the world has witnessed the terrible Franco-Prussian War, the war between Turkey and Greece, the war between England and the Transvaal, the war between China and Japan, the war between Japan and Russia, the war between the United States and Spain; so that, within the memories of yet vigorous and active men, every great nation of the world—England, the United States, Germany, France, Spain, Russia, Italy, Turkey, China, Japan, all of them—have been involved in war. Shall we see no more terrible wars? To ask this question in the light of history and of the racial instinct is to answer it.

And it is agreed that these future wars, and particularly so far as this country is concerned, will be determined upon the seas.

This fact ought to determine us, so far as our own welfare is concerned, upon the character of our naval policy. But, above this, standing here as the dominant and responsible power of one-half of the world, our duties and liabilities in the Western Hemisphere are vast and growing, and we must be in a position to meet them.

But, above this, we owe a duty to the whole world. We can not sit idly by and see other nations go on in a mad race to build up great navies with which to threaten the peace without being in a position to assert ourselves in behalf of the peace of the world. Our Navy is to-day steaming toward Cuba, not to intervene, but by the possibility and ability to intervene to restore peace. Does this smaller lesson convey to gentlemen no suggestion of the possibilities of its reproduction upon a far larger scale? This is what I mean, and the latter ideas I have been expressing are what I had in mind when I stated at the outset that I feared gentlemen viewed this question with a too limited vision.

Mr. Chairman, I am for an adequate Navy, as promised by the Democratic national platform, and I want to say in con-

clusion that no political party can afford to incur the distrust of the country with reference to the national defense. The national sense of honor is a tinder box, needing only the spark of danger to explode it, and the Nation will cry with one voice, "Are we ready?" and if we are not ready, then God help the party or the policy responsible for lack of readiness. The people will not.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Chairman, this Nation ought to have a great and high ambition, and to my mind the field of that ambition is to exert its influence toward the establishment of the world's universal peace. [Applause.]

No longer I hope will the leading minds of this great Republic be moved by an ambition, to show to the world a great Navy strutting and posing, with its cruel guns, bellowing a message of brutality and death to mankind in this civilized age.

We are told that we must stand for a Navy if we would be popular. The trouble with our House of Representatives, and the trouble with our politics, and our parties, to-day is the effort to be popular. [Applause.] The lessons of history tell us that no great hero of the past, or great man of the past, was in his day very popular. The advocates of new truth, the pioneers of justice and right, ever since the dawn of history, have not had the crowd with them. The world has waited and built their monuments centuries after they were dust. They were outcasts while they lived. They were unpopular. If our motto is always to be to vote for and support only that which is popular, the days of the Republic are numbered.

I am ready and willing to talk about something else besides popularity in these days. It is not safe for us to enshrine our heroes until they are dead and a long time dead. If there is one lesson the American people ought to learn it is not to worship individuals, but to reverence principles, to enshrine our ideals rather than men, and march forward toward the realization of those ideals of right and justice and peace. [Applause.]

We are always told that the way to have peace is to prepare for war. No long-standing proverb or saying has less sense or less logic. I assert that the way to prepare for peace is to be peaceful. [Applause.] How are we going to have peace? If we have passed the youth day of bombast and swagger as a nation, then let us stand on the rock of faith and trust to that which is best in men and in other nations as well as ourselves, and we shall have no war. The way to have peace, Mr. Chairman, is to have faith in peace [applause] and to quit the popular hurrah for navies that has so long moved men and nations to the sensational and spectacular. Human reason is always swept from its throne by the spectacular, but we face a new day and, I trust, a new era.

I want to say this in passing, that I have not any faith in "peace," if it is not to cost us something.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Minnesota be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Chairman, the individual who avoids brutal contest and physical battle, sometimes at the cost of a little suffering, learns that it pays a bigger dividend than anything else. The greatest teacher whoever stepped upon this grain of sand has taught us that it is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong. I am not so afraid of our national pride, and all that sort of thing, that I would not be willing as an American citizen, honoring my flag, I trust, as well as any man in the Nation, that I would not be willing that we pay our share of the cost of an enduring peace among the nations of the world. [Applause.]

That which is worth the most to mankind ought to cost something and as a Nation we should be willing to pay it. I will admit I am tired of the talk of peace that seems to mean nothing. We talk peace and prepare for war. We boast that we are a peace-loving people and proceed to build large navies. This Nation made the greatest mistake in all the centuries when it voted to fortify the Panama Canal. [Applause.] It stood at the pivotal moment when it could have shown that its trust and confidence was in the good will of men and not in the disposition to fight. Yes, we talk peace and then we get ready for war. The time is coming when the manhood and character of this Nation will spurn this spirit of resentment, of war, just as civilized people to-day can only have a good standing in the world by going into court rather than by putting a chip on their shoulders and going out to slug somebody.

On what principle is it that civilized men settle their differences in courts of justice? On that same principle civilized

nations may settle their disputes without resort to force. Slowly it may be, but surely we are outgrowing the degrading brutalities of the past and asserting a higher freedom and nobler national dignity. Our true defense is moral. Our armor is the virtue and patriotism of a great people, and our real scepter is our love of peace.

I do not know but that I will vote for one battleship. I have voted for one heretofore. I have done it reluctantly, and I am frank to say that I believe you are nearer right over there than we are. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Navy is not symmetrical. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GRACE] said in his address the other day, it is top-heavy. Yes, it is top-heavy and it is show heavy. Has not the time come, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, for us to show the world that we mean in good faith to maintain that peace which, though it may cost us, as well as other nations, something, will be a blessing to all men?

What we need in this day and age of ours is faith, faith not only in the possibility of peace, but in the practicability of peace. [Applause.] Right may be radical, but it is always practical. Only small minds shrink from it and say: "At a more convenient season I will call for thee."

I think the position of the present Executive on this subject reflects high honor upon the Nation and makes his administration worthy of a place in the centuries, because it is a step toward the world's final peace. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

[Mr. SAUNDERS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. WILDER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to three men almost in succession talking against the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri. It seems to me, however, there ought to be some golden mean that we might strike on this subject between the somewhat ambitious program suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and the do-nothing policy of his party caucus. It seems as if in these days the pendulum was inclined to swing extremely to one side or extremely to the other, as if we have arrived at a time when a sane proposition would scarcely receive the attention of anyone. One has said that in order to be peaceful we should act in a peaceful manner. About everything I have heard said on this subject indicates to me that there is a lack of practical relation and application between our naval affairs and our Army affairs. An army can be built up in a very short order, but not so with a navy. Suppose when Japan started in her recent war that ended with the sinking of Rojstvensky's ships in the Japan Sea she had not been able to go in a harbor in Korea and sink a couple of Chinese ships to start with. Suppose Dewey had not been able to take his swing in Manila Bay and sink every one of Montejó's ships without a single loss of life. Suppose Sampson or Schley, whichever one it was who did the fighting at Santiago, had had no ships with which to meet and sink Cervera's ships. I might go on indicating suggestions of this sort to quite some extent. As I have said before, armies may be raised in short order, but not so with ships. We come down to the Spanish-American War, and we put \$50,000,000 at the free use of the President of these United States—enough money to build five battleships such as contemplated at the present time. The result of that war went into the hundreds of millions before we were done with it. Of what moment is the cost of few or many ships compared with the need at such times? A warship means about 10 cents apiece of the entire inhabitants of this great Nation. Two mean 20 cents apiece, and it will not be paid by the very poor, but more of it will be paid by the others; but that is the average.

Another has said that we should have a Navy and Army somewhat commensurate with the great importance and wealth and power of this country, and in the same argument he rather reluctantly indicated that he might stand for one more ship and wished there might not be any. I wish there might be two. It is an incidental proposition when the insurance of this country is contemplated, when the well-being of this country with all its immense wealth is contemplated. I will doff my hat to no one in my desire for peace, but what good does it do to propose peace when the navies of some other nations are threatening our peace? That is exactly the condition in which the other nations of the earth want us. "Who are we standing for? Are we standing for ourselves or other nations of the earth? It seems to me that the most common kind of prudence requires that we provide our national armament in advance for those things which we can not prepare in a moment, and that fact is essentially true in reference to the Navy; but this is not necessarily so or in such a manner the fact in reference to our Army. It is notorious that our Volunteer Army—that is, the men who

come from the State militias, or even the farms or factories and otherwise—do substantially as good service as the service of the Regular Army. But what are we to do for ships? Are they to be brought from the farms? Are they to be grown on the farms? No; they must be prepared beforehand. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to speeches that have been made on each side of the House for peace, the prophecies of the millennium, and all that kind of thing. After all, I do not believe in the millennium. If we want complete rest, I trust we will get it after we cross over, because we are to be changed in the twinkling of an eye. But if there was an absolute millennium on earth, and the human family had complete rest, we would go back to barbarism. So I am not in favor of the millennium as long as we remain as we are. The human animal is a virile one. What is true of individuals is true of nations. Gentlemen, the oldest civilization is in China, with her 400,000,000 of people. The German, the English, and the French zones divide up their influence in China; and it is only because of the leadership of William McKinley and those who succeeded him that we at last have the open door in China, that otherwise would have been closed if it were not for the United States—Japan coming in as a factor with Great Britain. Mr. Chairman, if the nations of the world would let the Chinese alone, they would conquer the world by their patience and industry. We do not do it. We shut them out because we can not compete with them. They have no navy. They are a peaceful people. And yet they come and go and submit to the will of little Japan and all the other nations.

Now, the United States—and I confess it—is the greatest nation on earth—almost the greatest in population and every other respect. What are our burdens? What are our duties? They are to preserve the Government of the people first, to care for the greatest coast line of any nation on earth, to protect production at home and commerce among ourselves and with foreign nations, and to support the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. Chairman, would gentlemen reject the Monroe doctrine? It is a matter of serious consideration and, perhaps, discussion as to whether there ought to have been a Monroe doctrine; but we have it, and if you propose to abandon it the multiplied millions, amounting to the whole population, would rise up and say "no."

I want to be practical. We have these burdens. We are building the Panama Canal. We have, with a very small per cent of our production, the greatest foreign trade of any nation on earth. They do not want our trade? Oh, no. They would not take our trade if they could get it. Mr. Chairman, I met a missionary on my way home a few days ago who is located in far-away Tibet—a very intelligent man, attached to the missionary corps. He told me about the Chinese. He was in that part of Tibet that now belongs to China. I said, "How about the opium trade?" He replied, "China never wanted opium. It was forced on her." I said, "At last we have agreed it shall not be forced on her longer." He said, "The opium-producing colonies of Great Britain were so languishing in their production on account of the loss of the Chinese market that the British merchant was demanding that the exclusion of the opium policy should be abandoned." I said, "Do you think there is any danger of it?" He said, "I do." I replied, "Why, she is a great Christian nation and the mother nation of this country." "Yes," said he, "it is a great nation and it is the mother country, but for all that and with her trade and with her power she wants markets."

Mr. Chairman, suppose we sit down and inaugurate in the United States the millennium, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NYE]. It would no sooner be inaugurated than this most promising market in the world would be divided up into zones of influence, as China is now divided by the virile nations of the world. Ah, you say, but they can not conquer us. We are bigger, without arms and without training and without a navy, than all the balance of the world. Great thunders of the Fourth of July, they dare not tread upon us! [Laughter and applause.]

Well, now, I believe in a reasonable Navy, not the equal of Great Britain, but—

Mr. CLINE. Would the gentleman make as the basis of our Navy our coast line?

Mr. CANNON. Coast lines are a valuable adjunct. Why, that coast line has enough tonnage and enough commerce to make it the principal factor in building up and sustaining the great shipyards in this country. Without that patronage they would go into decay.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McKELLAR). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman require 10 minutes?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; only five minutes. I should be modest about asking for time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] be allowed to continue his remarks for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me just a moment, I desire to say that at the conclusion of the gentleman's five minutes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] desires five minutes, and I shall then move to close debate.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not insist upon that. I should like to have five minutes on this question.

Mr. PADGETT. Then I will include five minutes to the gentleman from California. I now move, Mr. Chairman, that debate close at 2 o'clock. It is now 25 minutes after 1. I have allowed a great deal of leeway already.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope I am conservative. I hope I do not desire to see our country engaged in war. I hope we may have continuing peace. But as to that prophecy about pruning hooks and swords—I believe it originated with Isaiah—bless my soul, I believe it is farther off now than when it was uttered over there in little Palestine.

Do you say, "Are we going to abandon progress?" No; by no manner of means. But I say there is no great nation, in my judgment, save alone the United States, that is not increasing its armament. We have got so much room to expand in, growing from ninety millions to four hundred millions, so much room upon this continent that we are not crowded now, and will not be perhaps for the next hundred years, for a breathing space. But all the other great nations of the earth are increasing their armament. What for? For trade, for commerce. Why? Because without the trade and without the commerce they believe that their people could not be employed. That is the reason why. Ah, England was willing to quit building if Germany would quit building. But Germany would not.

Now, all I want to do, inasmuch as it takes three years plus to build a battleship, is to have at least two battleships all the while in process of construction to take the place of the two or more ships that will be antiquated. [Applause.] That is all I want. Why, the Oregon, whose trip around the Horn caused the construction of the Panama Canal, is now practically old junk, and there are many others like it. Naval architecture progresses.

People prophesy that the aeroplane is to be the great war force or war weapon of the future. Perhaps so. But we can not afford to sit down and see the world develop the aeroplane. We can not afford to see them monopolize the high explosives and the higher explosives. We have got to keep step. It is insurance. It is the best insurance. By keeping step with the weapons with which to preserve peace we insure peace, I trust, without war.

It has been said that we have ever presented a vigorous manhood. But I do not care how vigorous is the manhood of one man or ten thousand, if you will send them up against one man or ten thousand armed with a repeating rifle that loads in the cartridge and will bring down 15 or 20 victims and then load again in less than 30 seconds, the one would almost put the unarmed ten thousand to flight under such conditions. I shall vote for two battleships, and do it heartily. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the ex-Speaker of this House, who has just taken his seat, has voiced the sentiment of a certain school of political economists in this country whose teachings are based upon the doctrine that our future greatness depends upon the size and strength of our standing armies and threatening navies. I am truly glad to know that there is another and better school of political economy abroad in our land, based upon that immortal doctrine enunciated by our Saylor more than two thousand years ago: "On earth peace, good will toward men." I stand for this doctrine to-day and invite you to accept it as our national policy instead of that offered by our distinguished ex-Speaker. While his tenure of office in this House has been long and his political sagacity is great, yet his doctrine had its origin in barbarism and blood and found its greatest supporters in paganism and polygamy. It stands to-day for force and murder and is a living menace to our intellectual and moral growth and to the prosperity and happiness of mankind. Its best beast is slavery, torture, and death, and

the brightest page of its history is the blood of 15,000,000,000 men, women, and children. What a fitting tribute Gen. Sherman paid to it when he said, "War is hell." [Applause.]

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the doctrine of peace had its origin in love and liberty. It stands for the rights of men, wherever they be, rich or poor, high or low, and against the shedding of human blood. Its greatest weapon is, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." It is supported by the best religion the world ever knew, with an instinct of a happier life in a better world. The brightest page of its history is the saving of the souls of men from the sins of the world. Then, in the language of our greatest modern soldier, "Let us have peace."

Mr. Chairman, the policy of this Nation has always been for peace. Our forefathers left kindred and homes of plenty across the sea to satisfy their longings for peace of conscience and peace of state and pitched their tents in an unknown land where the flash of sabers had never been seen and the roar of cannons had never been heard. A mere handful of men and women with the Bible in their hands and the love of God and liberty in their hearts, in the midst of wild beast and savage men, established a new civilization and surrounded it by school-houses and church houses as its wall of defense. Acting under the inspiration of this national policy, the seed of these God-fearing men and women has developed and multiplied until to-day we stand first in power and influence among the nations of the world, while other countries, with a national policy of force and murder, have dwindled in national importance and lost much of their former prestige. The sturdy manhood of our citizenship has always been equal to the emergency, and whenever our peace has been threatened by insurrection at home or invasion by enemies from abroad it has furnished us with the volunteer soldier—the best soldier the world ever knew—and being armed with right, we have always been thrice armed for victory. On all occasions, whenever forced to fight, America, without a strong navy and a large standing army, has always maintained herself both on land and on sea, and in every contest in which she has been called to measure her metal she has acquitted herself most nobly. [Applause.] What she has done in the past she is able to do in the future.

At the court of The Hague its representatives talk of world-wide peace and spread this news to the four corners of the earth, and yet the great nations of the world are running mad in trying to outstrip each other in the size and strength of their navies. At the same time they are annually appropriating large sums of money to experiment in the construction of successful flying machines, with the hope of arming them with skyrocketts to be dropped down like flaming meteors from heaven to destroy these mighty fleets. [Applause.]

And yet, Mr. Chairman, in the face of all this madness, I am sorry to say, we have men here on the floor of this House contending that we should appropriate from \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000 annually for the purpose of constructing great seagoing hounds, surpassing in viciousness, if possible, Dante's hell hounds, to keep up an eternal yelping the world around. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the time has come when some great power should propose to the nations of the world the dismantling of battleships and their elimination from the high seas as a means of settling international disputes. It is to the great discredit of the world that such disputes have hitherto been settled by the arbitrament of battle. The wonderful progress of mankind demands a more peaceable method of adjustment, and to continue a policy of blood and bluster is to oppose the advancement of the times. The statesmanship of to-day ought to be clothed in the garments of the progress of the times and no fourteenth-century statesmanship policy should be contemplated for America. In the light of our present advancement and our peculiar fitness for leadership among nations I feel that we should be first to propose this great reformation, and to show our good faith in the wisdom of such a national policy let us stop building for terror and trouble and let all of our works be for peace and progress. Let us propose to the representatives at The Hague that they prepare an international arbitration treaty at their next meeting for the adjustment of all international controversies, to be submitted to the civilized powers of the world for their ratification, the same to become effective between the countries so ratifying on and after such ratification. Our Constitution was drafted and adopted on this plan. Such a treaty would be worth more to the peace and advancement of mankind than all the battleships which could be constructed at the present rate of building in the entire world for the next century to come. There is no reason for a strong standing navy unless it be for the purpose of carrying on war. [Applause.]

The preachers in the pulpit plead for universal peace, the newspapers and magazines of the world daily fill their columns with reasons and plans for it, the statesmen in their council chambers throughout the civilized countries talk in favor of it, but annually construct against it.

The rulers of nations exchange diplomatic papers concerning it and lead the people to believe that they are about ready to adopt it, but at the same time they go ahead with the construction of new monsters of the deep, with greater speed and greater destructive powers. It will never be accomplished until some great power formulates a plan for it and has the moral courage to carry it out. A nation is not necessarily prepared for war because she has a large standing army and a big navy. We whipped Great Britain in two wars, one on land and the other on the sea, and yet we had no standing army for the one (Revolutionary War) and but a small navy for the other (War of 1812). The cause of right was with us in both of them and undoubtedly gave us an overshadowing advantage which resulted in our victories.

Mr. Chairman, the world is practically at peace to-day, but there never has been such a scramble among nations for big fleets and improved engines of death as is going on now. I am forcibly reminded of a story I once heard of a camel on coming in the presence of a wild boar that was busily engaged in whetting his tusks on the root of a tree, had his curiosity so aroused that he inquired of him, "What are you doing, sir?" Whereupon the boar replied, "I am preparing for war in time of peace." The wild-boar policy is what our ex-Speaker and his school of statesmen are advocating for America. Philosophers often peer into the misty future and foretell coming events, thereby giving the people an opportunity to escape disaster. Noah built the ark long before the flood, yet it was the means of perpetuating both human and animal life and the species thereof. Joseph was sold into Egyptian bondage by his envious brothers, but his preparation for the seven years of famine was the means of saving the lives of his cruel brothers. It is a most noble mission to prepare in advance for future happiness and prosperity, but no one can justify preparation for human slaughter and human destruction. The wild-boar policy originated in the dens of the devil. The Bible teaches us that on a certain occasion Jesus found a certain man possessed of many devils, and after casting them out they entered a herd of swine, and the entire herd ran into the sea and were drowned. Whether the wild boar escaped and is at large as a missionary of the devil I am not prepared to say, but it is quite evident that his doctrine is not in harmony with doctrine of peace and the golden rule and ought not to be accepted by any civilized power. Our greatest war is our war against war, and we ought to wage this war so unrelentingly in every clime until we prevent wars.

Mr. Chairman, we have not yet taken into consideration the question of our new possessions—Hawaii, Philippine Islands, Guam, Porto Rico, the Panama Canal, and the Canal Zone. Many of our citizens and some Members of this House believe that a strong navy is necessary in order to properly protect these possessions and discharge our duty to other nations whose citizens are interested therein. Members of Congress plan for the government of the Philippine Islands as though they were permanent property of ours. Capital is flocking there for investment and trying to gobble up the valuable parts of these rich islands in order, as I take it, that our permanent possession may be made possible. I am not in sympathy with this policy. America should retain the permanent possession of territory which may become States of this Union ultimately, and all property within our possession which is not so intended should be handled by us as a protectorate until a republican form of government can be established, with the view of ultimate independence for such territory. This ought to be our policy with the Philippine Islands, for it is evident that they can never become States of our Union. They are too far away and too far south. Their people are not Caucasian, and hence not desirable as part and parcel of this country. While they are intelligent and able in business and government, yet their environments and their social status is so at variance with our customs and institutions that they can never be amalgamated with us. Our other possessions are so close to us that we do not need a big navy for their protection. There can be no excuse, Mr. Chairman, for a strong navy in America unless it is to perpetuate a colonial policy. [Applause.]

It may be that America will embark upon this dangerous program, but if she does she has the history of the world against her. I have no doubt but that we have men in this Chamber who would gladly see her adopt such a policy, but even the thought of its possibility makes me tremble for the safety of my country. It is a trait of human character that we do not like to keep costly things just to look at. We are anxious to

put them into use, if for no other reason, just to see how they work.

The same thing is true of nations. Large standing armies and big navies are highly expensive, and if a nation has been at great expense to maintain these luxuries, in the course of time she becomes anxious to try them to see how they work, and might pick quarrels on trivial matters as an excuse to declare war for conquest. It is the history of the world that all republics which have taken on a colonial policy have ruled their colonies ruthlessly and, in many instances, cruelly, thereby engendering hatred among the subjects against the mother country, which has invariably resulted in rebellion and the loss of liberty. Ancient Venice, Genoa, Athens, Pisa, Carthage, Syracuse, Rome, Holland, and republican France all tell the same sad story. They not only lost their colonies, but they lost their own liberties. Mr. Lincoln said that no man is good enough or wise enough to rule another without his consent. The same is true of nations. No country is good enough or wise enough to rule another country without the consent of the people of that country. With the fate of both the ancient and modern republics which have adopted a colonial policy staring us in the face, who will declare for a colonial policy for America? As the lurking magazine lieth in watery ambush to blow unsuspecting fleets into fragments, so lieth the colony of a republic to blow her ship of state into kindling wood. Beware of a colony for our Republic, my countrymen, oh, beware! [Applause.] A few days ago the House adopted an amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill for the purpose of stimulating and encouraging the construction of a system of good roads in this country by giving national aid thereto. Were we to expend as much money for this purpose annually as we have been using for the construction of battleships it would not be long until America would have an ideal system of hard roads, and it would add real and substantial happiness and prosperity to our own people. Internal improvements ought to command our best thoughts and our wisest action, for therein lies the greatest hope for the happiness of our people and the perpetuity of this Republic. Let the battleship give place to good roads and internal improvements generally.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, since my refulgent light spread itself upon this House, relieving the former Erebus and atmospheric oppression, I regret that I still find there is a dearth in finding out what is done and said upon this floor in matters of so much importance as this. Why, three years ago I made a speech here—a great speech [laughter]—the greatest speech; in fact, the only speech that was made upon the battleship proposition. [Laughter.] If there had been a censor upon the speeches that went into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a historian beside, who would keep account of those things, the subject matter of this debate never would have again occurred, because they may have read my speech. [Laughter.] In fact, I believe some Member having the good of the country at heart should introduce a bill making ineligible for reelection anyone who did not read my speech.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I first offered an amendment to strike out the two battleships in my adolescent period of service. I got 17 votes upon that amendment. The next time it came up, having more influence, I got about 18 votes against the two battleships.

And then you all know that I am a caucus man. [Laughter.] I have been extremely fortunate in the Democratic caucuses, because whenever I have bolted a Democratic caucus they no sooner get back into the House after my vote had been recorded and the fact was known in the Senate and its intelligence was communicated back to the House than it immediately comes over to my side. [Laughter.]

Now, in this matter, contrary to the usual method, I stood by the Democratic caucus decree, and again the Democratic caucus is standing by me. Therefore I take pleasure in casting my vote against the two battleships. [Applause.]

I want to say to you, furthermore, gentlemen, that, notwithstanding you did not read by speech of three years ago, if you had read my speech I delivered yesterday, each and all of you would vote against the battleships for the very reason that battleships have gone out of commission. Aeroplanes and waterplanes have taken their place. I asked the chairman of this committee who these experts were that they called before the committee to determine what was the proper appropriation to make for the development of aeroplanes, and it developed that these men came before this committee before the greatest exploit of the greatest development of the age had been made at Weymouth, England, on the 10th of this month, where it was shown that the aeroplane or, rather, the waterplane, can rise from the deck of a ship without running space; that it can rise from the water; that it can descend upon the water; that it can descend upon the land; and that it can go to a distance of

500 miles without making a landing either upon the land or upon the sea. In such a case, with our immense seacoast and borders, what is the necessity of longer fortifying our coast? Why, gentlemen, it is absolutely senseless, and the fortification of the Panama Canal is so much money thrown away. Gentlemen, do not be so self-centered; for the sake of the country and for your self-respect, please read my speech. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] a few moments ago spoke of the "mad rush for war." I want to ask him whether the people of the United States were not just as ready and just as mad to rush to war after the battleship *Maine* was sunk in Habana Harbor as the most excitable nations on earth? I want to ask him whether it did not require all the skill and ability and energy of the then President of the United States, the lamented McKinley, to hold Congress back from precipitately declaring war against Spain, in order that this country might be at least partially prepared for the then impending conflict?

Mr. Chairman, war comes suddenly. It comes unexpectedly; and it is the experience of the modern world that the more a nation is prepared for war the less the likelihood of that nation becoming involved in war. The highwayman lurking in the shadow of a tree for a likely victim seldom undertakes to attack a strong, powerful individual who might worst him in the fight. He rather looks for a physically weaker brother, one who shows evidence of being more apt to fall at the very beginning of his onslaught. It is even thus with nations. This country stands behind the Monroe doctrine. There is not a man in this House that dare cast his vote against the maintenance of that doctrine. I believe the overwhelming sentiment of this country would be for war if war were necessary to maintain it. If we intend to maintain it, we must have an adequate fleet. Our fleet is the only thing that will stand behind that doctrine. It has nothing behind it in international law. To-day its strength lies largely in the will of the people of the United States.

And what is happening on the American continent to-day? In South America large numbers of settlers from foreign countries are taking up great areas of the rich agricultural and grazing land. I understand that in Brazil alone German colonizing concerns have taken up 8,000 square miles of land. The States of Santa Catharina and Rio Grande de Sul are largely controlled by German companies. The nations are reaching out for the trade of South America. They are sending their immigrants and their settlers there, and these create a market for the products of the mother country. No one can tell what complications may arise as the result of this colonization. We have nothing but the tacit consent of European countries to our maintenance of the Monroe doctrine. I do not believe that a single power in all Europe has ever acknowledged acquiescence in the doctrine in writing. Indeed the soundness of our position has been attacked occasionally in recent years in various European periodicals. A sharp attack on the Monroe doctrine appeared in a recent number of a leading German review—the *Grenzboten*—and the *National Zeitung*, commenting on that attack, urges the Fatherland to examine closely whether things resting on such shallow legal and historical foundations as the Monroe doctrine need be tolerated, or whether, at the bottom, they are not merely American arrogance which requires sharp and decisive opposition.

Admiral Mahan, in an article published in the *New York Times* on the 24th of this month, says that twice recently, once from Canada and once from an English source in China, has come a suggestion that the present feeling of Germany against Great Britain might be placated by Great Britain repudiating the Monroe doctrine. Personally I have no reason to believe there is anything in the suggestion to cause alarm. But the game of world politics is an absorbing one. Combinations and alliances are oftentimes made between world powers that are startling in their effect upon world policies. We are an isolated nation. Many of our statesmen have strenuously contended that therein lies our strength. But in my opinion that very isolation demands of us the construction and maintenance of a most powerful Navy, especially if we expect to continue our championship of the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] well stated the case of the oldest nation in the world, China. The Celestial Empire has been bullied by every little nation that wanted a slice of her territory. She has had to suffer indignities, she has had to concede "spheres of influence" to the land-grabbing countries of the world. Why? Because she has neither an adequate army or navy to defend herself.

Does anyone believe that China, with her teeming millions, would be a prey to the rapacity of European nations for territorial aggrandizement if she were adequately prepared to defend her rights? Why, of course not.

Man is a fighting animal. There is no use trying to deceive ourselves. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that the millenium has not yet come. The fighting instinct seems to be inborn. Deprecate the fact as we may, we see that instinct manifested in the fights among schoolboys. As we reach maturer years the instinct is outgrown by most of us. And yet in many cases it is only latent, and it frequently asserts itself upon slight provocation even among adults. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] speaks of settling cases in court. True, the great majority of men take their differences into the courts and cheerfully abide by the judges' decisions. But some men still resort to murder in settling their disputes. Men are still shot down by such of our countrymen who refuse to submit their causes to peaceful arbitration. And while I am as strong an advocate of peace as any Member on this floor, I am nevertheless of the opinion that many questions between nations will continue to be settled by the arbitrament of war. It will be many generations before we can settle everything in the courts.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. KAHN. I have only five minutes. I yield, however, to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I merely wish to say that the Monroe doctrine is recognized by nearly all the nations of the earth, and certainly has not been invented for the purpose of keeping up militarism in the United States.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, there is no question about the fact as to why the Monroe doctrine was enunciated.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And another thing—

Mr. KAHN. I can not yield any further. As a matter of fact, the Monroe doctrine was announced at the time when the Spanish-American colonies were throwing off the yoke of the mother country and were assuming their stations as American Republics. It was enunciated because President Monroe at that time believed that no foreign power ought to be allowed to take land forcibly on the American continent. He undoubtedly voiced the sentiment of his period. We had but a few years before concluded our second war with Great Britain. Our Navy played a glorious part in the settlement of that war. There was no question as to its ability to cope with the navies of the other world powers of that epoch. And in announcing his famous doctrine, President Monroe undoubtedly believed that the prestige won by the American Navy in the War of 1812, and the heroism manifested by our naval commanders and sailors in the war against Algeria, Tunis, and Tripoli in 1815 were but an earnest of a strong and powerful Navy for all time to come.

Mr. Chairman, it has been well said that "battleships are cheaper than battles." I firmly believe in that declaration, and so believing, I heartily advocate the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] for the construction of two battleships at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. McCALL. Will not the gentleman agree to prolong the agony for just two minutes? [Cries of "Vote."] The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS]. Without objection the amendment to the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBERTS) there were—ayes 60, noes 87.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts and Mr. PADGETT were appointed tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 80, noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. Chairman, I have only five minutes. I yield, however, to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I merely wish to say that the Monroe doctrine is recognized by nearly all the nations of the earth, and certainly has not been invented for the purpose of keeping up militarism in the United States.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, there is no question about the fact as to why the Monroe doctrine was enunciated.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And another thing—

Mr. KAHN. I can not yield any further. As a matter of fact, the Monroe doctrine was announced at the time when the Spanish-American colonies were throwing off the yoke of the mother country and were assuming their stations as American Republics. It was enunciated because President Monroe at that time believed that no foreign power ought to be allowed to take land forcibly on the American continent. He undoubtedly voiced the sentiment of his period. We had but a few years before concluded our second war with Great Britain. Our Navy played a glorious part in the settlement of that war. There was no question as to its ability to cope with the navies of the other world powers of that epoch. And in announcing his famous doctrine, President Monroe undoubtedly believed that the prestige won by the American Navy in the War of 1812, and the heroism manifested by our naval commanders and sailors in the war against Algeria, Tunis, and Tripoli in 1815 were but an earnest of a strong and powerful Navy for all time to come.

Mr. Chairman, it has been well said that "battleships are cheaper than battles." I firmly believe in that declaration, and so believing, I heartily advocate the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] for the construction of two battleships at this time. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. McCALL. Will not the gentleman agree to prolong the agony for just two minutes? [Cries of "Vote."] The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS]. Without objection the amendment to the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBERTS) there were—ayes 60, noes 87.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts and Mr. PADGETT were appointed tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 80, noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FITZGERALD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3367) to amend section 2291 and section 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to homesteads.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 23634. An act to authorize the village of Oslo, in the county of Marshall, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Two fuel ships to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$1,140,000 each.

Mr. CONRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, it is not worth while to report the amendment until the point of order is disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true. The amendment is not in order pending the disposition of the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, last year we made an appropriation for two fleet colliers at this point in the bill. As I understand it, these are unauthorized unless they are colliers.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, these are colliers. We are calling them fuel ships, because the last battleships are being constructed to run with oil instead of coal, and the department desires some of the colliers equipped to carry oil as well as coal, so that to designate them that they may not be confused with the exclusive coal-carrying colliers we designate them as fuel ships.

Mr. GOOD. Then they are to take the place of ones we appropriated for last year, except that they have an equipment for oil?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "each," on page 63, line 13, insert the following proviso:

"Provided, That no part of the appropriation shall be expended for the construction of any such ships by any person, firm, or corporation which has not, at the time of the commencement and construction of such vessels, established an 8-hour work day for all employees, laborers, and mechanics engaged on or to be engaged in the construction of the vessels named herein."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment, in substance, that was offered heretofore that has been passed over. I ask unanimous consent that it remain in abeyance until we reach line 20, on the next page, page 64, when we will take up the matter of general legislation, and if we do not agree on anything we will return and dispose of this.

Mr. CONRY. Well, on the condition that it remains pending.

Mr. PADGETT. That it remains pending, just as the others.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as pending and be passed over for the present. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, line 13, after the word "each" strike out the period and insert a comma and insert the words "which shall be built in a navy yard."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, as the other amendment provides that it should come in after the word "each" it will not come at that place if the other is adopted and the character of the amendment at this time not being either a substitute or an amendment to this amendment it would not come in unless the gentleman from New York consents that this one come in ahead of his.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer that as a substitute for the other amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the other amendment has been passed over informally.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that by unanimous consent the gentleman from New York be given the privilege of withdrawing his amendment to be offered at the conclusion of the bill if he desires.

Mr. PADGETT. At this point?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. That is all right; I have no objection to that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to withdraw his amendment and have the right to return to this portion of the bill and reoffer it after that section of the bill if he so desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his colleague be permitted to withdraw his amendment for the present with the privilege after the consideration of the bill has been concluded of recurring to this paragraph for the purpose of reoffering this amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the amendment I have offered.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, has the amendment been reported?

The CHAIRMAN. It has.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the experience of the Government in building its own war vessels, auxiliaries, and so forth, has been of great advantage not only to the Government but to the men who are employed in that class of work. It has reduced the contract price paid to the private-contract shipyards. It is admitted by all of those who know about the conditions that the men are securing better conditions, and also that we are getting a better class of work done when these vessels are constructed in the Government shipyards, and therefore I hope that the amendment which I have offered will be agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that these ships are to be built in a navy yard and not elsewhere. It is a plain and simple question. We have had a number of illustrations with reference to it. The *Florida* and the *Utah* were duplicate ships, sister ships. One was built in a navy yard at a cost of \$6,200,000, not counting \$500,000 of overhead charges, which, if you add the overhead charges, would amount to \$6,700,000. The other ship, the *Utah*, was built by contract at \$4,020,000. There was another instance where we built the *Prometheus* and the *Vestal*, two colliers, that cost us in a navy yard \$1,150,000 in round numbers and in private yards, by contract, we could produce the ships for \$890,000.

Mr. CANNON. How much was the first?

Mr. PADGETT. The colliers, a million and a half in round numbers.

Mr. CANNON. And in private yards?

Mr. PADGETT. Eight hundred and ninety thousand dollars in private yards. Now, with this simple statement, I do not care to argue this question. If the House sees fit to place this limitation upon it—

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. In a moment. And requires them to be built in a navy yard, you must realize that we must increase the appropriations to pay for them.

Mr. HENSLEY. Will the gentleman from Tennessee give any reason why this great difference? Why should there be such a difference as this?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; there are several reasons. One of the reasons is that the navy yard pays higher wages. Another reason is that the navy yard employees get about 28½ days of holiday with pay during the year; and then, I think, with the lack of business organization and utilizing to the best advantage, the labor employed in the navy yard is not adequate to that in private yards under private management.

All of these things contribute to the cost. Now, it is a plain, simple question, and I am not going to take up the time with it. A few weeks ago I had a conversation with a labor leader that to me was very illustrative. He came into my room and said he wanted to urge that we should build one of the battleships in the navy yard compulsorily. I said to him that I could not take that position, that it was a question of labor and that labor was employed wherever it is built—whether in the private yard or in the navy yard the labor is employed and paid. He said, "Yes, that is so; but in the navy yards we get much better pay and we get holidays with pay and leaves, and so forth." I said to him, "If that is true, why is it that the employees in the navy yards are always complaining of their wages and demanding of us that we shall increase them?" Then it was he made the reply, "If we do not

make complaints and keep up a fuss about our wages they may be reduced." I said to him, "Do you think as a patriotic citizen that is the way to deal with your Government?"

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. In the incident that the gentleman cited to the committee, where the battleship and collier were made in private yards, were they made under the eight-hour system?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. The outside contracts were made, as I understand it, on a nine-hour basis.

Mr. MAHER. What is the difference in the construction of the *Louisiana* and the *Connecticut*?

Mr. PADGETT. There has always been a dispute over that, but not a very great difference, I think.

Mr. MAHER. Do you know what the difference is?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember the exact figures. I have not looked into it of late years.

Mr. MAHER. I think the facts will show that there is no difference whatever.

Mr. PADGETT. There is some difference. The navy yard is greater—about 4 per cent.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. PADGETT. The *Louisiana* cost \$7,426,000 and the *Connecticut* cost \$7,911,000; something like \$500,000 difference in the cost. Repairs up to an even date on the two ships are—on the *Louisiana* \$547,351 and on the *Connecticut* \$634,234.71.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. As I understand the gentleman, it is proposed to amend this bill so that in cases of contract for the building of ships it shall be done by 8-hour labor.

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. It is provided it shall not be built by contract at all, but shall be built in a Government navy yard.

Mr. CANNON. But I am speaking of the general legislation.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. In the bill which this House passed and the Senate has favorably reported, and which you propose to put upon this bill, that provision is made?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; for the 8-hour law. And we have placed the appropriation on the 8-hour basis for all the work.

Mr. CANNON. And the gentleman states that the wage in the navy yard is much larger than in the private yards?

Mr. PADGETT. I said materially.

Mr. CANNON. Materially larger; with leaves of absence, and so forth?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Those are favored places in comparison with the great bulk of mechanics who are in union labor and who will be under the eight-hour law?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. Then, I will ask the gentleman if, in the last analysis, labor does not pay it all?

Mr. PADGETT. This is a discrimination against outside union labor in favor of the labor in the navy yards, to which we are already giving advantages and favors that outside labor does not possess.

Mr. CANNON. And outside union labor increases 10 times in number, in comparison with that in the yards?

Mr. PADGETT. That is true.

Mr. CALDER. There are 10 other ships in this program, are there not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CALDER. They will be built by contract in other yards?

Mr. PADGETT. There are some small ships to be built in other yards. The position I take is this: It is a wrong policy and we are running wild on this question. Let us allow the Government, which is spending the tax money of the people, free to contract this work where the Government will get the worth of its money, and for the benefit of the labor that is outside as well as inside of the navy yards.

Mr. SIMS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield to his colleague [Mr. SIMS]?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. SIMS. In making these calculations as to the cost of building a ship by contract and by the Government, does the gentleman allow nothing for interest on capital invested by the private contractor?

Mr. PADGETT. Nothing whatever.

Mr. SIMS. And does the gentleman say that the Government, on account of the increased amount of wages paid, loses all the difference claimed and allows nothing for repairs or insurance or replacement or interest on the capital?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Then you must have a very incompetent set of men in charge of the navy yards if they can not do better than that.

Mr. PADGETT. I am only telling what the cold facts are. I said that a lack of proper organization and ability to utilize the organization is contributing to the excess cost.

Mr. SIMS. If they are not any more competent to do a business transaction that that, that makes a difference as great as you make it and allows nothing absolutely for interest and replacement and maintenance and insurance, they are not competent to be in charge of a hen roost. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I yield to the member of the committee [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is it not a fact that those who made the statement before the committee to the effect that they were paying, I believe, 25 per cent more than private shipyards finally stated that they did not know what private shipbuilding companies were paying? Did they not?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I think not. They stated that the expenses are fixed by boards, and that upon the general average they made about 25 per cent more than the outside shipyards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of continuing the policy of building some of the vessels authorized for the Navy in Government yards. In 1900 I initiated a movement in this House which resulted in the adoption of a policy by which the Government yards, which are maintained at a very great expense, were utilized to a very small degree in the construction of new vessels for the Navy. Ever since that policy was initiated the department has been doing its utmost to discredit the yards and to bring into disrepute the new work done there for the Navy.

We have established powder factories, and in those factories we manufacture powder more cheaply than we can purchase it by contract. We maintain arsenals at Rock Island, Ill., Frankford, Pa., and Springfield and Watertown, Mass., and in those arsenals we manufacture small arms and ammunition more cheaply than it can be manufactured by private contractors. We seem to be able to enter into any line of manufacture of munitions of war and to compete successfully with private manufacturers excepting in the construction of ships. In determining costs in this line, by a skillful jugglery of the figures, it is made to appear that it costs inordinately more to build ships in a navy yard than by contract in private yards.

The *Connecticut* and the *Louisiana* were built as the first ships in competition, one in a navy yard and one in a private shipyard. The navy yard was without full equipment, without experience, without practice, and yet, despite the utmost efforts of the Navy Department to show a very great discrepancy, and although they charged against the yard building the ship even the cost of educating at the Naval Academy the officers employed in the yard, the best that could be done was to make a difference of about 5 per cent in the cost.

The navy yard worked 8 hours as against 10 hours in the Newport News Shipbuilding Co.'s yard. I have been reliably informed that the private yard was compelled to work overtime in order to keep pace with the progress made on the *Connecticut*. For the first time in the history of the Government, as a result of that competition, a ship authorized by the Government was turned out within the time fixed by the contract—three years—instead of running from 36 to 42 months over the time.

Since then we have been getting our ships in less than three years' time instead of in seven years' time. The ships now authorized to be built by contract are no longer utilized by the private contractors as a means of keeping their plants going while the interests of the Government are sacrificed, but the interest of the Government is now compelled to be put first.

When this movement to utilize the navy yards started a differential of 4 per cent was given to shipbuilding plants on the Pacific coast, and, taking the bids submitted year after year, the low bid on the Pacific coast was to a penny exactly 4 per cent in excess of the low bids on the Atlantic coast.

They talk about the difference in the cost of building these ships. I demonstrated to this House last year by a carefully drawn diagram prepared by an expert in the Navy Department, who resented the practices indulged in there of misleading the country and the House, that they had shifted from the ordinary yard-maintenance charges over \$600,000, if I recall correctly, to the cost of the ship there under construction, and to refute the conclusions of the department I demonstrated that at a period when there was no ship under construction the overhead charges had increased at the same ratio as when a ship was under construction and the maximum force employed thereon.

What has resulted from this practice? The gentleman speaks of the cost of the *Utah*, \$4,200,000, and yet the testimony before his committee is to the effect that the contractor who built that ship built it at a loss of in the neighborhood of \$500,000. Is it a wise policy to have our ships built by contractors at a loss of half a million dollars? Does that explain many of the mysterious accidents that are happening upon our contract-built ships in this country? The battleship *Florida*, just completed at a navy yard, is heralded as the fastest battleship afloat, exceeding the speed requirements of the specifications and making almost a knot better than her sister ship built in a private yard, and for the first time in many years since the paying of a bonus for excess speed has any ship built for the Navy exceeded in so marked a degree the speed requirements set forth in the specifications.

Mr. KOPP. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPP. Is it the gentleman's position that this increased cost in the navy-yard-built ship is due to the indirect charges solely?

Mr. FITZGERALD. My position is, in the first place, that the difference in cost which is pretended by the department does not exist. In the second place, whatever difference does exist is due in some part at least to the inefficient manner in which the department is at present conducted, and I am not certain but that it is done deliberately for the purpose of stopping yard construction, although I should be reluctant to believe such to be deliberately done.

Mr. KOPP. Will the gentleman yield for another question? I call his attention to the fact that according to the testimony before the Naval Committee the difference between the two ships—the *Florida* and the *Utah*, one built by private contract and the other in the navy yard—was \$2,182,000, while the total indirect charges were only \$954,000, leaving over \$1,000,000 after you have taken out all indirect charges. How can the gentleman explain that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Add \$500,000 dead loss to the contractor and it comes down to half a million dollars, and still the contractor apparently is engaged in the eleemosynary work of building ships for the Government for nothing.

Mr. KOPP. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. And if there be no other objection, I would object to permitting any contractor to work for the Government for nothing, particularly in the vital matter of building battleships or other ships essential to the defense of the country.

Mr. KOPP. Granting that what the gentleman says is true and that the contractor lost \$500,000 on that ship, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is still a difference of \$700,000 after taking out that loss, if there be a loss, and after deducting all the indirect charges.

Mr. PADGETT. I call attention to the fact that the two million one hundred thousand and some odd dollars does not include the \$500,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not agree with those figures.

Mr. KOPP. That is the testimony.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman asked me a question. I do not agree to those figures.

Mr. KOPP. So far as that loss was concerned, it was merely an estimate on the part of Admiral Watts, that he believed the contractor must have lost \$500,000. Personally I do not believe they are doing business for nothing or at a loss.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is talk here about the cost of building ships at the yards, and last year or the year before

much ado was made over the fact that it was necessary to increase the limit of cost of a yard-built ship, because it could not be completed within the limit of cost. Is there complaint when they can not build ships authorized by contract within the limit of cost? Not at all. The latest vessels authorized to be built by contract, I am informed, were treated in an interesting manner. When the bids were received, the bids were all in excess of the limit of cost. Did the department come to Congress and complain that it was impossible to build those ships, as they did with the ones placed in the navy yards?

Mr. PADGETT. They were less than the limit by about \$100,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They could not be built within the limit of cost.

Mr. PADGETT. They were built within the contract. The contract limit of cost was \$6,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman will pardon me while I make my statement, I think I am correct. When it was ascertained that it would not be possible to get the ship that had been laid down as planned they substituted inferior material in many respects. They substituted nickel steel for special hardened steel that was intended to be placed in the ship. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee if that is not true?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not heard that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have, and it is a matter of some notoriety, but it has not been done so far as I have been able to learn as to any ship that was set to be built in a Government yard.

Mr. Chairman, there was without question some years ago an understanding among the shipbuilding plants of the country to divide the business of the Government among them, and never until we initiated the policy, not of building all the ships—we have built, I think, ships costing some \$25,000,000, out of a total of \$396,000,000, in Government yards—never, until this policy was established, was the hold of the Shipbuilding Trust on the Government broken. A new standard of efficiency and speed in construction was also established, which elicited the admiration even of the great British naval constructor who visited this country about two years ago and expressed surprise that it was possible to put a ship off the ways as speedily as we did the *Florida*.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have his time extended two minutes. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to ask the gentleman from New York if he can reconcile this: Here is a statement in the hearings by Rear Admiral Watts, Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, who says that the labor cost on the *Florida* was \$2,815,388.15—that that was the whole labor cost according to the statement of the constructor. Now they tell us that, due to the increased cost of labor in Government yards, one vessel costs more than two millions more, due to labor cost, than in a private shipyard.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can not reconcile the figures nor can anyone else. They do not fit. The labor cost is not very much different from the cost of material. Double the labor cost, make liberal allowances for all other items, and there still remains almost a million dollars of the stated cost to be allotted. In that connection let me call attention to the fact that under the direction of Congress the Department of Commerce and Labor made an investigation to determine how it was that working 10 hours a day the Newport News Ship Yard had hardly been able to keep up with the Government yard with an 8-hour day. The report of that department made to the House shows that twenty-four and a fraction more per cent of work was turned out in the Government yard in an 8-hour day than in the private yards with a 10-hour day. So remarkable and astounding was the record that the naval attaché of the German embassy asked me to furnish a copy of that report for transmission to Germany, in order to show the capacity and efficiency of the Government yards in this country.

To illustrate the difficulty of obtaining accurate information about costs from the Navy Department let me remind the House that when it was proposed to compel contract ships to be built in yards having an eight-hour day it was asserted that the cost would be increased 20 to 25 per cent. The following statement shows bids for collars to be constructed under the eight-hour provision and without it.

Proposals received for the construction of fleet colliers Nos. 9, 10, 11, and 12.
[Proposals opened June 20, 1911.]

Name.	Time, months.	Number of vessels.	Class 2, bidders' price—plans.	Remarks. ¹
Newport News Steamship & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va.	Both in 22.....	Nos. 9 and 10.....	\$995,000	} Proposal accompanied by certified check for \$60,000. } Vessels to be constructed at Newport News. } Babcock & Wilcox boilers. } Bond for \$35,000. } Transverse system. } Isherwood system.
	Both in 22.....	Nos. 11 and 12.....	\$975,000	
	4 in 24.....	(Nos. 9 and 10.....	\$980,000	
		(Nos. 11 and 12.....	\$980,000	
Maryland Steel Co., Baltimore.....	Both in 22.....	Nos. 11 and 12.....	\$997,000	
	1 in 18.....	1 of 11 and 12.....	\$84,000	
	Both in 24.....	Both 11 and 12.....	\$973,000	
	1 in 18.....	1 of 11 and 12.....	\$62,000	
	Both in 24.....	Both 11 and 12.....	\$951,000	

¹All proposals based on second form of payment in Construction and Repair letter June 10, 1911.

No proposals received under Class 1, department's plans.

Publicly opened at the Navy Department by direction of the Secretary of the Navy.

²Each.

_____, Solicitor.

Mr. Chairman, Nos. 9 and 10 are to be built under the 8-hour law; Nos. 10 and 11 are not so restricted. The Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co.'s bids show a difference of \$20,000, or 2.05 per cent, only. If they get four they would build each of them for \$980,000; that is, there is apparently no difference in price between those under the 8-hour law and those not under it, or if there is any difference, as may be noted, it is \$5,000, or only one-half per cent.

Comparing Maryland Steel Co.'s bids, the lowest, \$951,000, as against Newport News Co.'s high bid, \$995,000, there is only a difference of 4.6 per cent. It is to be noted that the Maryland Steel Co.'s bid is for the Isherwood system of construction, which is undoubtedly somewhat cheaper construction than that for which the Newport News Co. bid.

As far as the general provisions are concerned with regard to these bids, they speak for themselves.

They demonstrate the futility of accepting the figures of the department upon the question of cost. I favor the pending amendment; I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments close in 10 minutes.

Mr. REDFIELD. I will say to the gentleman that I would like five minutes.

Mr. CALDER. I want a few minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. All you gentlemen are on one side, and you ought to be content with four speeches against one.

Mr. JONES. I would like five minutes on the gentleman's side.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will modify that and move that all debate close in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be given to the gentleman from California, Mr. KNOWLAND, 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. REDFIELD, both on one side, and 5 minutes to Mr. JONES, on the other side.

Mr. CALDER. I hope the gentleman will extend it three minutes more.

Mr. PADGETT. I will make it 18 minutes, to give 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. CALDER.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 18 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, the statements of the chairman of the committee would, I am free to admit, present a very strong case against the construction of ships in navy yards were they to go unchallenged. But I want to present to the House some facts that I believe will convince this body that instead of resulting in a loss to the Government that the construction of these colliers in navy yards has resulted in a direct saving to the United States.

Let me call your attention to the fact that in 1908 the naval appropriation bill provided for the building of two colliers. It was understood that these two colliers were to be constructed in private shipyards, and the limit of cost placed upon them was \$1,800,000 each. No protest was made in the committee as to the cost, and no one voiced a protest on the floor of this House. An amendment was inserted on the floor providing that one of the colliers should be built in a navy yard of the United States. That amendment remained in the bill.

Immediately private shipbuilding firms reduced their prices. Bear in mind that \$1,800,000 each was to be the cost of these colliers, but as soon as we provided that one should be built in a navy yard of the United States the various private firms submitted exceptionally low bids ranging from \$822,500 to \$900,000. There were three or four separate bids, and these bids were all so much alike that it at least gave suspicion of collusion. The result was that the Secretary of the Navy refused to build the collier in a navy yard notwithstanding the mandate of Con-

gress, because of these bids—no doubt at below cost. The next year the bids were raised to \$900,000, then to \$1,000,000, and again to \$1,100,000.

This year the limit of cost is placed at \$1,140,000. After the eight-hour law was placed upon construction of the colliers there was only one of these private concerns that submitted a bid, and that bid was for \$1,500,000, a larger amount than it cost to build the collier in a navy yard of the United States. A contract has since been let to a private firm at a lower figure, made possible because this firm was given a contract for two colliers. A navy yard could build two much cheaper than one no doubt. I believe it is sound business policy for this great Government, in order to maintain the navy yards at a high standard of efficiency and to retain an efficient, skilled, and permanent force of mechanics, to occasionally build a ship in these yards, and I also contend that it has a tendency to keep the private shipbuilding firms from combining and submitting excessive bids. We know in one instance that it has resulted in lowering the cost of colliers from \$1,800,000 to less than \$1,000,000. I would not advocate the building of all ships in navy yards, but we find that nearly every foreign country—France, Germany, England, and Japan—are building some of their ships in the navy yards, because they appreciate that to keep these yards up to a high standard of efficiency, and to retain skilled mechanics, has an excellent effect upon the private shipbuilding concerns. While it may cost a few dollars more, in the long run we are saving money to the Government by providing that occasionally small ships at least be constructed in the navy yards of the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. REDFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, had he gone a little more in detail into the cost of the *Florida*, would have discovered a state of facts which I am inclined to think would have surprised him, for it is a fact that the engines of the *Florida*, which were built at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, actually cost less—some tens of thousands of dollars less—than the engines of the *Utah*, which were built at a private yard in Camden, N. J. The fact was stated to me by one of the engineer officers of the Navy. I went to the Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering and asked him if it was true that the engines of the *Florida* actually cost less than the engines of the *Utah*. He said it was true. I asked him if he would put it in writing, and he did. He gave me the figures, and I have them. I have them not here with me, but I showed them at the time to my colleague, Mr. FITZGERALD, and so far as the construction of that portion of the ship is concerned—and it is a very large portion, nearly or quite one-third of it—it actually costs less to-day to build the great engines of battleships in the Brooklyn Navy Yard than it does at private plants; and the detail facts I shall be very glad to state as soon as I can look again at the letter. The difference is some tens of thousands of dollars in that one ship.

Secondly, no one has ever ventured to question that the Government gets a better ship when it builds its own vessels; and it gets a better ship for two very excellent reasons. In the first place, the element of profit is entirely left out. The private contractor, if he will survive, must make, if he can make, a profit out of his vessels. In an effort to meet the competition of the navy yards they have sometimes failed to make a profit; but the effort for profit is always there in the private ship and can never be eliminated in any calm judgment of the wisdom of building a ship in a private or a public yard. Apart from the element of profit, which is in every one of the ships built in the private yards, there is the high professional pride of the naval constructors in building a better ship with their own hands for their fellows to use; and in a thousand little details

that make up the life of a battleship and count for its security, and especially bear upon its cost of maintenance and repair, the public-built ship is a better-built ship and a cheaper ship to maintain, a better vessel in very many ways than you get out of a private yard for the same or a less price.

I am not myself wholly unfamiliar with the facts from personal knowledge. Before I ever expected to enter these halls I was in a way connected directly with the building and equipment of four of our great vessels, one of them built in a public yard and three in private yards; and it is true that you get a better ship all through if she is built in the navy yard than you get if she is built with the necessary element of profit which is necessarily present in a private yard. And for the evidence of it you have only to look at two vessels recently constructed under the same specifications, with each of which I had myself a little something to do—the *Florida* and the *Utah*. The *Utah* far outdid any other previous ship. I said to the admiral commanding the Bureau of Steam Engineering, "Wait until the *Florida* comes." He said, "She will hardly do better." And I said, "She will." And she did better. So that the fastest ship and the strongest ship we have got, beating not only all other ships, but beating a fine ship built in a private yard, under the same specifications and at the same time, is the *Florida*, built in the Brooklyn Navy Yard. You have got to explain these hard, solid facts away before you can say it is always cheaper to build in a private yard, for in what does cheapness consist—first cost or ultimate cost? Never in first cost, unless the ultimate cost can be considered, and not alone in ultimate cash cost, but in usefulness, endurance, stability, and power, and in this respect unquestioned and so far unchallenged by anybody, the ships built in the public yards have been supreme. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES. I did not expect, Mr. Chairman, to take part in this debate, but I have been so much astonished at the statements that have been made by gentlemen favoring this amendment as to the comparative cost of building ships in Government yards and building them in private yards, and as to the comparative strength and speed of ships built in Government yards and those built in private yards, that I can not permit these misleading and absolutely unfounded statements to go unchallenged. The facts show just the reverse of what is claimed by these gentlemen. I wish first to notice the statements made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. The gentleman has stated that the *Florida*, which was built at a Government yard, was one of the few of our battleships whose speed has exceeded that required in the specifications. He would create the impression that the battleships built in private yards had fallen short of the speed requirements. Let me tell the House, Mr. Chairman, that the great battleship *Delaware*, which was built at Newport News, Va., by the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., one of the world's most powerful *Dreadnoughts*, exceeded its contract speed by 1 knot. Many of the greatest battleships of our Navy were built by this great private shipbuilding concern, and there has never been one of them whose speed did not exceed that required under the specifications. The *Texas*, which is designed to be the most powerful battleship afloat, and which was successfully launched only a few days ago at Newport News, is to cost the Government less than \$6,000,000. It was estimated by the Brooklyn Navy Yard authorities that it would cost \$7,500,000 to build this ship at that yard. The Government has thus saved more than \$1,500,000 by building this ship at this great private yard. Something has been said in regard to the *Louisiana* and the *Connecticut*, built some years ago. The *Louisiana* was built at Newport News, a private yard, and was completed five months ahead of the *Connecticut*, built at a Government yard. It is true that the *Louisiana* was built under the 10-hour system, but it is not true, as has been stated, that any nightwork was done upon that ship. These facts show what little reliance can be placed upon the alleged facts of the advocates of this amendment.

I wish to say further, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentlemen who represent Government navy yards that it is known to everybody who possesses any knowledge upon the subject that ships can be and are built cheaper in private than in Government yards. I had not supposed until I listened to these gentlemen that this was a question about which there was any room for argument or dispute. I deny, too, most emphatically that the ships which are built in private yards are in any respect inferior to those built in the navy yards. The facts absolutely disprove such absurd charges as these.

The Government has its representatives and expert supervisors and inspectors stationed at every private yard where a Government ship is being built, and there is not a bolt that goes into the construction of that ship that is not carefully in-

spected. These inspectors are thoroughly trained men, whose competency is beyond question, and they reject every piece of wood or steel which does not come up to the most rigid requirements of the specifications. The naval constructors, under whose supervision the ships are built in private yards, are experts in shipbuilding and it is not possible for any private shipbuilding concern to slight Government work. Those who are competent to speak upon this subject know that this is true. It is a serious reflection upon the Navy Department to intimate that private yards turn out inferior work and for that reason are enabled to build Government vessels at a less price than they can be built in Government yards. It is easy enough for gentlemen to make these charges, but I challenge any man upon this floor to name a single ship ever built for the Government by the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. that was not built strictly according to specifications or into which inferior material or bad workmanship entered. It is easy to make unsupported and reckless charges such as these, but it will be quite another thing to prove them, and I demand the proof. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, in the naval bill of two years ago one battleship was authorized to be built in a Government yard and 1 battleship and 15 auxiliary vessels were authorized to be built by contract. In the naval bill of last year 2 battleships and 12 auxiliary craft were authorized, all to be built by private contract. So that in the two years past out of 23 vessels provided for only 1 has been authorized to be built in a navy yard of the country. In the program of this year there are 13 vessels authorized. We come here to-day and ask that 2 of those 13 be built in Government yards. We do not ask that all of these vessels be built at navy yards, but simply a small proportion of them. It has been our argument, Mr. Chairman, for years that it ought to be the policy of this Government to continue in the highest state of efficiency some of its navy yards, so that at a moment's notice they will be able to handle any naval proposition that may be put upon them. Now, to those of you who are not familiar with navy-yard matters, let me suggest the fact that three or four times each year the fleets come in for repair, and between the time the fleets are in and away at sea many men are discharged from the navy yard and the efficiency of the force is broken up, and I am advised by no less authority than the Secretary of the Navy himself that while a ship is under construction at the yard, when the fleet comes in for repair or alteration, it is the custom to take the men from the new vessel and put them on the repair work. This is done without the slightest inconvenience, and enables the Government to fit the fleet for sea without delay at much less cost than if it were compelled to call in several thousand men, many unfamiliar with naval work, employ them for several weeks, and then lay them off again.

Such has been said of the difference in the cost of construction of vessels built in the yards and those built by contract. We are informed that before the session ends to-day an amendment is to be put into this bill providing for the construction of all these vessels by 8-hour labor. When that is done it will materially increase the cost of the contract-built ships, with the effect that unquestionably we will be able to compete with the private yards of the country almost on equal terms. And taking into consideration the necessity of having at least two or three of our great yards constantly in shape to handle this work at a moment's notice, it seems to me the argument falls to the ground.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois will prevail; it will mean that the navy yard at New York will keep its very efficient force together for another year, at least, in the construction of one of these colliers. During the debate this afternoon the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] made the statement that the attitude of the Democratic Party in caucus in opposing the construction of any battleships this year had met with almost universal favor throughout the country, and he particularly cited the attitude of the newspapers of the country. Such has not been my experience, as an evidence of the public sentiment of the great State of New York on this important subject, and, as I understand it, the feeling throughout the entire country can be no better emphasized than in the editorials of some of the great New York dailies, which I propose to print as a part of my remarks. The *Brooklyn Eagle*, *New York Times*, *New York Sun*, *New York Herald*, all four the most independent politically of any newspapers in the country:

[From the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, Mar. 27, 1912.]

A DEMOCRATIC CRISIS SELF-PRECIPIATED.

The Democratic House caucus has resolved that there shall be no increase of the strength of the Navy this year and no measure to au-

thorize any new Federal buildings. The national need had to be sacrificed to beat back the local greed. The Navy is a national need. The demand for Federal buildings on a numerous scale is a local greed. The local greed has fought the national need to a standstill, and the national need has been sacrificed to beat back the local greed.

This makes the House a slaughterhouse instead of a House of Representatives. It makes the caucus a trading body instead of a body of legislators for the public good. It is a disgraceful spectacle, but not an unintelligible or a surprising one. No political party has ever successfully been an enemy of the National Navy. The Whigs tried that before the Civil War. The Federals tried that before the Whigs. The Democrats tried it at times after the Civil War, and are now trying it again. They have made a mistake which ought to be fatal or which certainly ought to be at once retraced.

As usual, there are explanations. They are, however, explanations that will not explain. The people of the United States will not excuse Representatives who say: "We had to scant the Navy in order to beat the excessive demands for large Federal buildings in small towns." The subordination of a national need in order to curb a local greed will not be justifiable to the American electorate. The preservation of Democratic supremacy in the next House can not be made to depend on the beating of petty local sentiment for Federal buildings at national expense in hole-and-corner districts. There is a better alternative. It is to change the control of the next House of Representatives from Democracy to Republicanism. That has been done before because of the hostility of the Democracy to the Navy and of the surrender of the Democracy to banded rapacity for local buildings at national expense.

The action of the Democratic House caucus has done not a little to restore the Republican Party to House control. It can not be too soon and too absolutely renounced by the Democracy of this House, if that party would carry the next. The Navy can not be stricken down by the Federal-buildings ring of Representatives of both parties without the Democracy, which controls and is responsible for this House, losing the next. The loss of the next House should carry with it the loss of the next Presidency; and this in spite of Republican divisions or dissensions.

The Republican Party would welcome the opportunity to sink its divisions in order to rally the people for the preservation of the Navy against a party that would immediately cripple the Navy by a policy which would progressively destroy the Navy. "The Navy," triumphantly exclaimed Commodore and United States Senator Richard Field Stockton, "is the darling of the Nation." His words have not lost force or meaning or national hold on national sentiment. The House yesterday greatly weakened its hold on American sentiment, and the weakening of the hold is deserved.

We care not to deal seriously with the excuses. There was reason for patriotic Democrats to bolt the caucus. There was no reason for them to strangle the Navy in order to strangle the Federal-buildings ring. They could have left the fate of that ring to a not wholly demoralized Senate and to the action of a patriotic President and to the action of a patriotic people.

And the banded river and harbor cabal of rapacious Congressmen must yet be confronted, and it may drive the Democratic House to as pusillanimous a course as the Federal-buildings ring has done. There is no statesmanship in cowardice. There is no politics which commands respect in surrendering what should be preserved in order to flank what should not be tolerated. A party that truckled to free silver should have learned enough from surrendering its convictions not to offend the sentiment for the Navy by such a course as was taken in the caucus on Wednesday. The buildings ring could have been left to the Senate and the veto power. The Navy should not have been abandoned in order to head off a motley combination of jobbers and cranks.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 1912.]

BUILD THE TWO DREADNOUGHTS.

The interruption of the building up of our Navy for economical reasons would be bad policy, and we do not believe that the policy will prevail, in spite of the recent action of a Democratic caucus in Congress. Secretary Meyer's protest, printed Wednesday, states the case clearly. His arguments seem unanswerable, unless we are willing to have our Navy deteriorate. England is building five new *Dreadnoughts*, and Germany three, while Japan has ordered five. The Secretary of the Navy points out that one *Dreadnought* is the equal of five battleships of the older type.

The boast that the United States now occupies second place among the naval powers of the world is ill founded, according to the Naval League. We have not been keeping pace with the other powers in the building of warships of the latest type, and it would be blind folly now to lose the advantage of such progress as we have made. Provision should be made to meet the President's request for the addition of two *Dreadnoughts* to our fleet this year. The Democrats should take pride in the fact that much of the credit for the modernization of our Navy belongs to them. It began in the first Cleveland administration. The plan of building two new battleships yearly was the result of a compromise originally, as four were asked for in 1909, and the understanding reached then was that two should be authorized each year thereafter. No party question is involved in this matter. The caucus was controlled by a false idea of economy.

[From the New York Times, May 24, 1912.]

THE NEED OF INCREASING OUR NAVY.

Admiral Mahan presents in The Times this morning a clear and logical argument against the plan of the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives so to cripple the United States Navy as to affect our standing in the community of nations. Only by keeping our naval establishment on a footing with the great navies of the world can we secure peace to the whole American Continent and hold securely our foreign possessions. The policy of increasing the Navy by at least two ships of the first class every year should not be abandoned. Admiral Mahan points out that Mr. Stead, the peace advocate, favored as a peace measure the building of two British warships for every one built by Germany.

We talk a great deal of the Monroe doctrine. As Admiral Mahan says, the only leg it has to stand upon is a strong Navy. He finds a curious inconsistency in the fact that in the very session in which the House Democratic caucus voted against the appropriation for two battleships a Democratic Senator saw fit to introduce a resolution reaffirming the Monroe doctrine. The action of the House of Representatives in the matter of warships is purely political. It puts the majority in the light of rebuking Republican expenditures. The United States Navy, however, is neither Republican nor Democratic. The Senate should not hesitate to restore the appropriation for the new warships.

[From the New York Sun, Mar. 29, 1912.]

CRIPPLING THE NAVY.

The Democrats at Washington, by an almost unanimous vote in caucus, have decided not to vote any money for the construction of new battleships at a time when England has 18 *Dreadnoughts* completed and 14 building, when Germany has 9 completed and 15 building, and when Japan is preparing to add 8 *Dreadnoughts* and 8 powerful battle cruisers to her fleet.

Regarding the *Michigan* and *South Carolina* as *Dreadnoughts*, only because they have a main battery of eight 12-inch guns (they would be no match for the swifter and more heavily armed *Florida* or *Utah*), the United States Navy has 6 *Dreadnoughts* in her fleet, 4 more building, and 2 authorized. That is the end of the chapter so far as the Democratic Party is concerned.

The action of the Democratic majority is notice to the world that when the Panama Canal opens the United States will have only 10 *Dreadnoughts* in commission (the 2 ships authorized by the Sixty-first Congress will not have been completed), with no more than 12 ships of the first battle line in sight. If the canal should be finished in the summer of 1914, England will have 32 *Dreadnoughts* flying the flag and Germany 21. The *Dreadnought* strength of Japan at that time can not be surely determined, but her first battle line will be almost as strong as that of the United States, and Japan will be steadily pursuing a policy of naval expansion, such as the United States has abandoned.

A more alarming aspect of the case is that Germany, which may some day challenge the Monroe doctrine, not satisfied with 24 *Dreadnoughts* completed and building, is planning a battle fleet of 1 flagship and 5 squadrons of 8 battleships each, with 10 large cruisers and 30 small cruisers as reconnaissance ships.

In the general expansion of armaments among the great naval powers, the United States is compelled to relinquish the minimum of safety in new construction and go to the rear, because the Democrats in the House are bent on posing as the party of frugal economy on the eve of a presidential election. The American people have never been treated to such an exhibition of vicious humbug. No retrenchment could be more uncalled for, unpatriotic, and perilous, and it is flagrantly indefensible, because the Democrats in the Sixty-first Congress voted for at least one new *Dreadnought*.

[From the New York Herald, Feb. 2, 1912.]

BATTLESHIPS AS A MATTER OF BUSINESS.

Representative CLAUDE KITCHIN, of North Carolina, has favored the country with his reasons for opposing any authorization of battleships this session. In an explanation that must make the judicious grieve he delivers himself of the great truth that small ships can be built more cheaply than large ones. Quite so. Therefore, he concludes we must, for the present, delay providing battleships and authorize auxiliaries alone.

Has Mr. KITCHIN even given serious thought to what such delays in the past have meant to us? Between 1888 and 1900, for example, one hundred and ten millions were spent on warship construction and repairs. In seven months of 1898 the Spanish War cost us something more than five hundred millions. Had one-fifth of this last expenditure—let us say one hundred millions—been devoted to fleet construction, our sea force would have been doubled and four hundred millions of dollars would have been saved, for no Spanish War would have been fought.

With such odds in sea power against her Spain could, with honor, have declined hostilities, Cuba would have been freed, and reparation have been made for the *Maine*. And, happiest of all, the suffering and pathetic waste of life would have been spared. But no. The same delay Mr. KITCHIN is preaching now was preached then, and for the same reasons, and here, offered as a cold fact of business management, was the pitiable outcome of this policy of delay.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by striking out the letter "a" before the word "navy," and inserting the letter "s" after the word "yard."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modify the amendment by striking out the letter "a" in front of the word "navy," and adding the letter "s" to the word "yard," so that it will read, "which shall be built at navy yards."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. PADGETT. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 81, noes 19.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Six torpedo-boat destroyers, to have the highest practicable speed, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$940,000 each.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment and ask that it be considered as pending until after the amendment of the chairman of the committee is acted upon.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire the amendment to be reported?

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Yes, sir; and then be considered as pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "each," in line 16, page 63, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the construction of any of said torpedo-boat destroyers by any person, firm, or corporation which has not at the time of the commencement and construction of said vessels established an eight-hour workday for all employees, laborers, and mechanics engaged or to be engaged in the construction of the vessels named herein."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as pending and passed for the present. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not object, but I ask unanimous consent that every Member may offer an amendment at every paragraph in this bill that appropriates money to the same effect, and let them be pending.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, that was said facetiously.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

One tender to destroyers to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$1,315,000.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that after it is reported it be considered as pending and take the same course as the other one which I have just offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "dollars," in line 19, page 63, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the construction of said tender to destroyers by any person, firm, or corporation which has not at the commencement and construction of said vessels established an eight-hour workday for all employees, laborers, and mechanics engaged or to be engaged in the construction of the vessels named herein."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Four submarine torpedo boats in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$2,240,000; and the sum of \$800,000 is hereby appropriated for said purpose.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. First, let me ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG] if he proposes to offer that same amendment?

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. I wanted to offer a new paragraph at that point. Let the gentleman proceed with his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. CANNON. Unanimous consent is given to every Member to offer an amendment to every paragraph that appropriates any money. Two positives make a negative, and two negatives make a positive; and if it comes to two consents that comes to no consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "purpose," line 23, page 63, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the construction of any submarine torpedo boats by any person, firm, or corporation which has not at the time of commencement and construction of said vessels established an eight-hour workday for all employees, laborers, and mechanics engaged or to be engaged in the construction of the vessels herein named."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following as a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, after line 23, as a separate paragraph, insert the following: "The appropriation made by the act of May 4, 1898, for one gunboat to be built on the Great Lakes, to take the place of the U. S. S. Michigan (now Wolverine), is hereby made available for the construction of a river gunboat, which may, as advantage may offer, be built elsewhere than on the Great Lakes or their connecting waters."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, this is not an additional appropriation, but heretofore an appropriation was made to construct a gunboat for use on the Great Lakes; but on account of our treaty relations with Great Britain it can not be carried out. They need a gunboat of that description in Chinese waters, and this is simply to authorize the appropriation heretofore made for a gunboat on the Lakes to be for a gunboat to be used in Chinese waters.

Mr. PAYNE. To convert this appropriation in this way means, I suppose, an economy in the appropriations of this Congress.

Mr. PADGETT. This was an appropriation of a previous Congress, and it is proposed to use it for something that is now needed instead of for something that can not be used.

Mr. PAYNE. But doing it in this way will enable the gentleman to show a smaller appropriation for naval construction in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. This Congress is not responsible for it, because this appropriation was made heretofore, and the Secretary says he can not use it.

Mr. PAYNE. On account of our relations with Great Britain?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. And so we propose to sneak that appropriation into this bill for something that we do need, that should be charged to this bill but will not be.

Mr. PADGETT. I am perfectly willing to charge it here if you want to. We are going to use that appropriation to build a gunboat to be used in Chinese waters.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the square way would be to appropriate just this amount of money and have it counted in this bill as an appropriation.

Mr. PADGETT. I am putting it exactly in the language in which the Secretary of the Navy asked for it. I do not suppose the gentleman desires to discredit his own Secretary.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman does me too much honor when he credits me with the possession of so important a Secretary.

Mr. GOOD. What was the amount of the former appropriation?

Mr. PADGETT. It reads—

To cost, exclusive of armament, not more than \$200,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ESTOPINAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana offers an amendment, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a new paragraph the following:

"One submarine tender, to cost not to exceed \$1,000,000; and the sum of \$400,000 is hereby appropriated toward said purpose."

Mr. ESTOPINAL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide a tender for the submarines that have been appropriated for in this bill. We have now a number of submarines in commission, but there is not in the Navy a proper tender for those submarines. What tenders we have are make-shifts.

There are at present 16 submarines in active service provided with tenders which, although sufficient in number, are in all cases improvised for the purpose and are by no means efficient or satisfactory. The *Severn*, for example, has no motive power, and must be towed by another vessel, while the *Fortune*, on the Pacific coast, is but a tug, and the *Mohican*, of the Asiatic station, besides having no motive power, is very old and can be used practically only as a stationary barrack ship.

There are 4 submarines in reserve at Charleston with no tender whatever assigned, and these vessels can not operate at any distance from that place for this reason. The 4 submarines on the west coast which will soon be commissioned will have the services of the *Alert* as tender, but that vessel is nearly 30 years old and is not suited for such duty, although being the best available.

There are, in addition, 15 submarines under construction which will be assigned to the active flotillas in the next year or two, which, with the 4 boats in reserve at Charleston without a tender, make a total of 19 for which tenders will have to be assigned and for which but one such vessel, authorized last year, is the only provision thus far made. It should be noted that I make no reference to any submarines that may be authorized in the naval appropriation bill now under discussion.

As 1 tender can care for 5 submarines, it is apparent that 3 additional tenders should be ready for service in the comparatively near future. I am informed that there are no vessels of the Navy suitable for conversion to submarine tenders that can be spared from their present assignments, and that, furthermore, a thoroughly satisfactory tender can not be developed from a ship designed for other purposes without extensive expenditures.

The existing type of submarines and those now under construction are very dependent upon their tenders, which act as mobile bases, furnish quarters for the personnel, carry stores and supplies of all kinds necessary for the operation and maintenance of the submarines, and are equipped with suitable dynamos for charging their batteries, and with machine shops capable of making all ordinary repairs. Without a tender these submarines are very much restricted in their sphere of activities and can not venture far from a fixed locality.

With the long coast line of the United States and the present number of submarines in the Navy it is apparent that circumstances might arise rendering necessary a change of base of any of the submarine groups, involving possibly long distances to be traversed. Without sufficient tenders this would not be

possible and the consideration of both offensive and defensive strategy would be accordingly handicapped.

It, therefore, seems most important that this type of vessel be authorized at the present time, and accordingly I move that there be inserted in the bill under discussion the necessary authorization for the construction of 1 submarine tender not to exceed \$1,000,000 in cost.

As we are providing for submarines, we ought to provide for the necessary adjuncts to the submarines. I hope that this amendment will be adopted; it is almost useless to have submarines unless they have tenders.

I can assure the Representatives from the great interior ports of the country which are dependent, many for safety and all for their prosperity, in a large measure, on the stability of the improvement at the mouth of the Mississippi River, that the adoption of this amendment will have direct and important bearing on that protection, for it will enable the Department of the Navy to effectively patrol the waters of the Gulf of Mexico at its mouth with submarines fully equipped for such defense.

Mr. Chairman, I append a description of the modern submarine which has been furnished me, and which shows how much confidence we may place in them as instruments of defense, and the people of the Mississippi Valley may place great faith in them if a sufficiently large number, fully equipped for service, with the necessary tenders, be stationed at the mouth of the river:

The modern submarine is a vessel ranging in length from 150 to 230 feet, having a speed of from 14 to 17 knots on the surface and 10 to 12 knots submerged. Propulsion on the surface is by means of internal-combustion oil engines, usually of about 1,000 horsepower per boat, although one boat is being built with engines of 5,000 horsepower. These vessels are very seaworthy—can remain at sea without injury in the severest storms—and in this respect are superior to destroyers. They can cruise on the surface at a distance of 5,000 miles without replenishing their fuel supply. They can pass from the surface to the submerged condition in a time of only three minutes and can run completely submerged at any depth down to 200 feet, and can also, by means of their periscopes, obtain a view of the surface without danger of being themselves discovered, except when only a few hundred yards distant from the enemy. Even if discovered at this close range they are immune from attack for the reason that they can almost instantly dive to any depth desired.

Their armament consists of modern torpedoes, which, due to the fact that the submarine can approach with impunity to very close quarters, may be considered very accurate and exact. The chances of misses when fired from a submarine are very small as compared to the chances when fired from a long range from surface vessels. The uses of submarines in time of war would be both defensive and offensive. Primarily they would be used to protect seaports, landing places, and other strategic points. When provided in a sufficient number an attack from sea or the landing of an enemy's force is rendered practically impossible. For certain purposes of defense, such as the Panama Canal, the submarine would be as effective as a large fleet of battleships stationed on either side of the canal. Guns on shore alone could never fully protect this most important strategic point. A ship could lie off at such great distance as to be practically safe from the attacks of the fort and at the same time land shells into the canal, doing immense damage. As a weapon of defense the modern submarine as at present developed could be used in connection with the battleship fleet.

Its surface speed is now such that it could cruise with the fleet and would be left behind only in extreme cases—where the maximum speed of the fleet would be called for. Instead of accompanying the fleet modern submarines could be used to cruise in flotillas alone, searching out and destroying the enemy wherever he might be found.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted. It is contemplated that some of the submarines authorized in the bill will be sent to New Orleans for the protection of the mouth of the Mississippi. They will be built in the East; they can not be sent to New Orleans nor used after they get there without a tender, and I trust that the committee will agree to this amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman from Louisiana, Gen. ESTOPINAL, has presented these matters and urged them before the committee, and it is true that a submarine tender is needed. The committee did not include it in the appropriation bill, because, considering all matters and the amount of the bill, we felt that it was as much as the bill should carry in the report to the House. But this tender is needed, and if the committee sees fit to include it I shall not enter any protest against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, to follow right after the one just adopted, and I ask that it take the same course as the other amendments that have been passed in the same line.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by adding after the last word, as follows: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the construction of said submarine tender by any person, firm, or corporation which has not at the time of the commencement and the con-

tinuation of said vessel established an 8-hour workday for all employees, laborers, and mechanics engaged or to be engaged in the construction of said submarine tender."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that the amendment should be passed?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 63, after line 23, by adding the following paragraph: "The Secretary of the Navy may build any or all of the vessels authorized in this act in such navy yards as he may designate, and shall build any of the vessels herein authorized in such navy yards as he may designate, should it reasonably appear that the persons, firms, corporations, or agents thereof bidding for the construction of any of said vessels have entered into any combination, agreement, or understanding, the effect or the purpose of which is to deprive the Government of fair, open, and unrestricted competition in letting contracts for the construction of any of said vessels."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order to that provision.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is the same provision that has been in the naval bill heretofore.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It has appeared in the bill ahead of the provision for submarines. Submarines are of such a character and so controlled by patents that it is not possible for the Government to build them in the navy yards. If the gentleman will modify his amendment I will withdraw the point of order. I am in sympathy with it, but do not want to tie up the construction of submarines.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then I have no objection to excepting the submarines, and I will modify my amendment in that particular.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Chairman, can we have the amendment as modified read by the Clerk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy may build any or all of the vessels in this act in such navy yards as he may designate, and shall build any of the vessels herein authorized, except submarines, in such navy yards as he may designate should it reasonably appear that persons, firms, corporations, or agents thereof bidding for the construction of any of said vessels have entered into any combination, agreement, or understanding, the effect, object, or purpose of which is to deprive the Government of fair, open, or unrestricted competition in letting contracts for the construction of any of said vessels.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I have no objection to that.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the word "submarines" ought to be inserted in the first part of the amendment. It only appears once in the amendment, and it should appear twice. Let the Clerk report the amendment as it now stands.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy may build any or all of the vessels authorized in this act, except submarines, in such navy yards—

Mr. PADGETT. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California as modified.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and steam machinery of vessels heretofore and herein authorized, \$8,946,205.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "dollars," in line 2, page 64, insert the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation for the construction and machinery of vessels shall be expended for construction of any vessels by any person, firm, or corporation which have not at the time of commencement and during the construction of said vessels established an eight-hour working day for all employees, laborers, and mechanics engaged or to be engaged in the construction of vessels named herein."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that be considered as pending.

Mr. PADGETT. Consent has already been given for that.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee, in connection with this amendment and others, if this appropriation does not apply to the completion and construction of vessels where contracts have already been made?

Mr. PADGETT. The amendment has been offered, but it is simply passed for the present, and it should not apply to those heretofore contracted for.

Mr. PAYNE. I wanted to call attention to that.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. When we take them up for consideration we will also take up that question.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course you can not go into a wholesale violation of contracts by enacting legislation of this kind without its being subject to a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. They are just offered now and are passed subject to points of order and for consideration.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand that part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of the Navy; colliers: On account of two fleet colliers heretofore authorized, \$581,321.48.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk. It is an amendment of the same character as that which I just offered, and I ask unanimous consent that this be considered as pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the same disposition will be made of the amendment which the gentleman from Illinois has just submitted.

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire now to ask unanimous consent to offer at this place the bill H. R. 9061, the 8-hour law, as passed by this House at the present session of Congress on the 14th day of December, 1911, which is the one that I have heretofore mentioned several times. This act was passed by an overwhelming vote, a large majority on both sides of the aisle. It has been reported favorably, without amendment, by the Senate committee. Instead of having all of these various matters interjected through the bill here and there and elsewhere, so that we will have to deal with all of those separately, and which, perhaps, may be in conflict with the general law that may be passed, I am asking unanimous consent that this amendment may be incorporated. When the bill goes to conference, should the Congress change it in any way and the law become different, in the conference we would have this changed, made to conform to the law as it shall pass. If there is no change made in the bill, it would remain as it is; and should the Senate not take action before receding from the action of the House I should submit the matter to the House for its future instruction.

I desire to make that statement that it may be clearly understood what my purpose is. I ask that this may be incorporated as an amendment at this time, to come after line 20, page 64.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. What has become of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] to follow the word "cents," in line 9, page 64?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was about to inquire whether the gentleman from Tennessee offered his amendment as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PADGETT. I offer my amendment to come after line 20, page 64. I thought that had been reached.

The CHAIRMAN. That has not been reached.

Mr. PADGETT. Then I withdraw it until that time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN.] I want to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois, if he will give me his attention, that, as I understand the wording of his amendment, it would apply to all vessels that were authorized in the last Congress and which, as I understand it, are now under construction. Contracts have been let for the construction of those vessels, and to attach such an amendment as this to them would be a violation of the contracts which the Government has already entered into, and I do not think the gentleman desires to place the Government in any such position as that of impairing the obligation of its contracts.

Mr. GREGG of Texas. Would anything that we now adopt be retroactive?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. It would make it so here.

Mr. CANNON. Suppose it does; could we not pay the damage on suits brought in the Court of Claims?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Oh, yes; we could pay the damages, but we do not want to subject people who have entered in good faith into contracts with this Government to a suit at law.

I am in favor of these eight-hour provisions going on to all new authorizations in the bill, but I am not in favor of an eight-hour provision going on this bill which is going to impair a contract already entered into by this Government, and I do not think the gentleman from Illinois is.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I understand that those amendments are pending and are subject to points of order.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. This is one that has just been offered.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Yes; but the gentleman from Illinois has asked that it be considered as pending. It is in the same position as the others.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. That is what I have been endeavoring to find out.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Until the amendment which is proposed to be offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, to follow after line 20, page 64, has been disposed of.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will pardon me, I do not think he understood the parliamentary situation. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] offers this amendment to which I have reserved the point of order, but before any action could be taken upon it, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT], rose to his feet and asked unanimous consent to offer as an amendment at this time the general eight-hour law. That left the motion of the gentleman from Illinois wholly undetermined. I thereupon reserved a point of order, and pointed out to the gentleman wherein I think his amendment is out of order and not a fair motion to make on this provision of the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I simply wanted to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has in it a provision that exempts its application from contracts already made.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I am not finding any fault with the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee. It is the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, that preceded it, that I am questioning.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total increase of the Navy heretofore and herein authorized, \$16,839,373.48.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to present as an amendment the bill which I have just explained, which is the eight-hour law as it passed the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 20, page 64, insert the following:

"That every contract hereafter made to which the United States, any Territory, or the District of Columbia is a party, and every such contract made for or on behalf of the United States, or any Territory, or said District, which may require or involve the employment of laborers or mechanics shall contain a provision that no laborer or mechanic doing any part of the work contemplated by the contract, in the employ of the contractor or any subcontractor contracting for any part of said work contemplated, shall be required or permitted to work more than eight hours in any one calendar day upon such work; and every such contract shall stipulate a penalty for each violation of such provision in such contract of \$5 for each laborer or mechanic for every calendar day in which he shall be required or permitted to labor more than eight hours upon said work; and any officer or person designated as inspector of the work to be performed under any such contract, or to aid in enforcing the fulfillment thereof, shall, upon observation or investigation, forthwith report to the proper officer of the United States, or of any Territory, or of the District of Columbia, all violations of the provisions of this act directed to be made in every such contract, together with the name of each laborer or mechanic who has been required or permitted to labor in violation of such stipulation, and the day of such violation, and the amount of the penalties imposed according to the stipulation in any such contract shall be directed to be withheld for the use and benefit of the United States, the District of Columbia, or the Territory contracting, by the officer or person whose duty it shall be to approve the payment of the moneys due under such contract, whether the violation of the provisions of such contract is by the contractor or any subcontractor. Any contractor or subcontractor aggrieved by the withholding of any penalty as hereinbefore provided shall have the right within six months thereafter to appeal to the head of the department making the contract on behalf of the United States or the Territory, and in the case of a contract made by the District of Columbia to the commissioners thereof, who shall have power to review the action imposing the penalty, and in all such appeals from such final order whereby a contractor or subcontractor may be aggrieved by the imposition of the penalty hereinbefore provided such contractor or subcontractor may within six months after decision by such head of a department, or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, file a claim in the Court of Claims, which shall have jurisdiction to hear and decide the matter in like manner as in other cases before said court.

"That nothing in this section shall apply to contracts for transportation by land or water, or for the transmission of intelligence, or for such materials or articles as may usually be bought in open market, except armor and armor plate, whether made to conform to particular specifications or not, or for the purchase of supplies by the Government, whether manufactured to conform to particular specifications or not; Provided, That all classes of work which have been, are now, or may hereafter be performed by the Government shall, when done by contract by individuals, firms, or corporations for or on behalf of the United States or any of the Territories or the District of Columbia, be performed in accordance with the terms and provisions of this act. The President, by Executive order, may waive the provisions and stipulations in this act as to any specific contract or contracts during time of war or a time when war is imminent. No penalties shall be imposed for any violation of such provision in such contract due to any emergency caused by fire, famine, or flood, by danger to life or to

property, or by other extraordinary event or condition on account of which the President shall subsequently declare the violation to have been justifiable. Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or modify the act entitled "An act relating to the limitation of the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon the public works of the United States and of the District of Columbia," being chapter 352 of the laws of the Fifty-second Congress, approved August 1, 1892, or to apply to work done under contracts made prior to the passage of this act."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, just a pro forma amendment. As this was an act and we are incorporating it as one section in the bill here, in line 12, page 3, the word "act" should read "section," and, on page 4, line 8, the word "act" should read "section," as it is incorporated in this general act.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as indicated by the gentleman.

There was no objection.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Now I ask—

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Let me dispose of this. I ask unanimous consent, to expedite matters, that all of the amendments heretofore offered and reserved which have relation to the eight-hour law be now disagreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Do I understand the gentleman that that will include my amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly not; that is not embraced in the eight-hour law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all the amendments indicated that were offered as pending and passed by informally be considered as withdrawn. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment to be added as a paragraph at the end of the amendment just adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of the amendment just adopted the following as a new paragraph:

"That no part of the appropriation authorized by this act shall be expended for the pay of enlisted men or seamen, not including commission and warrant officers, while doing repair work belonging to any recognized trade on battleships of the Navy when such battleships are docked or laid up at any navy yard for repairs: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not apply to such ordinary duties as are engaged in by the crew while at sea excepting dismantling and assembling armament for the purpose of repairs."

[Mr. MURRAY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I quite understand the amendment. It is to prohibit repairs of any kind by enlisted men?

Mr. PADGETT. In the ships at navy yards aside from battleships. It takes the greater ships, but excludes the other vessels.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. The amendment goes a little bit further than that. It prevents the enlisted personnel of the Navy who are on battleships that are in navy yards from doing any work on that ship that is ordinarily done by the recognized crafts or trades in the navy yard while the battleship is in the yard except such ordinary duties as the sailors do at sea.

Mr. CANNON. I want to ask, and I ask in good faith for information, is it important when a battleship goes to sea that there should be some enlisted men aboard the ship who will be competent to make repairs necessary in distress—

Mr. PADGETT. Very important.

Mr. CANNON. Either from battle or storm?

Mr. PADGETT. Under any circumstances I think it is very important, and it does not occur to me that as amended this will prevent that, and therefore I did not object.

Mr. CANNON. But the men must know how.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Now then, if when they are in the navy-yard docks and being repaired, not being skilled, they are shut out from being skilled, it seems to me if this amendment is adopted the gentleman ought to increase the membership of the crew of the battleship by a sufficient number of trained mechanics to meet emergencies that might arise from war or from storm.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the gentleman from Illinois by saying that these ships have in their service machinists, boiler makers, and all those trades who may be needed to repair vessels at sea. For the last 20 years we have had enlisted men as boiler makers and such mechanics competent to keep things in repair.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that the reason for this amendment is because some of

the battleships during the present fiscal year have been put into a navy yard for repairs and because of a lack of funds in the Navy Department the crews, while the ships were in dock there or at the wharf in the navy yard, have been put to work doing things that are ordinarily done by the yard mechanics, and to make the situation more aggravated the yard mechanics that would ordinarily do that work were being discharged right and left because there was not money enough to keep them at work. Now, that is the situation, and this amendment seeks to prevent that recurring in the future.

Mr. CANNON. Now, let me understand. For the want of an appropriation, if the battleships were repaired at all, there was no money to pay the ordinary mechanic, who was discharged, and a seaman who was a mechanic, if he was fitted to repair it, was put at work on it.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Now, the claim is made that these seamen are not skilled mechanics and are not doing good work in addition to taking work away from the men employed heretofore.

Mr. CANNON. I take it they must be skilled mechanics, because the other sailor and navigator, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER], says that they have these mechanics, boiler makers, etc., in the regular crews, so that the gentleman must be mistaken.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I am telling the gentleman what the men in the navy yard say.

Mr. CANNON. What is the fact?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I am not competent to judge.

Mr. CANNON. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill and the gentleman from Massachusetts, who offered the amendment, if the gentlemen have taken in consideration the absolute necessity of much larger appropriations, so that these battleships when they come into dock could be repaired by the ordinary employee or mechanic in the navy yard, and therefore be something to pay? Otherwise we, by law, would shut out the mechanic, who I am sure is of equal skill and belongs to the regular crew which is enlisted, and prevent him, by this provision, from making in whole or in part—

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I want to say to the gentleman further—

Mr. CANNON. You know I am a landlubber. I want to know.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I want to say to the gentleman that I have heard of complaints coming from the enlisted men that they have been compelled to do work while the ships were in the navy yard that formerly had not been done by enlisted men when the ship was in the navy yard. There is a double complaint over this practice that has come to me.

Mr. CANNON. Was the seaman, who was competent to repair the ship, under pay?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. He was under pay, certainly; but the practice heretofore has been for the seaman not to be put to this kind of work when the ship was in the navy yard.

Mr. CANNON. What was he doing in the meantime?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I could not tell you. He did not want to do the work that shore mechanics should be doing.

Mr. PADGETT. I will be frank with the gentleman that I think the effect of this will be to increase the expense; but this House has manifested such a marked disposition to recognize the demand with reference to labor, that when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] modified it and placed it in the present form I said to him I would withdraw my opposition to it.

Mr. CANNON. How much does my friend think it would increase the expense?

Mr. PADGETT. I am not prepared to say.

Mr. CANNON. I want to make this remark in justice to all parties. I know the gentlemen on both sides of the House who represent the navy-yard districts. They are most splendid Representatives, and, if it costs two or three millions more, they are worth it.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I heartily urge the adoption of the amendment which my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] has just offered. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is not conversant with the conditions in our navy

yards, or he would not voice the objections which he has just made.

The purpose of this amendment is to prevent the employment in navy yards of sailors in work which is being done at those yards by regular mechanics of recognized trades. It is obviously unfair to these mechanics to have their work taken from them and given to enlisted sailors from the vessels. Whenever this takes place it causes friction on both sides. The enlisted men from the vessels resent their employment in other work not connected with their work as seamen, and the men in the yards, who have families to support and belong to recognized trades, naturally resent the competition of enlisted men in their work.

It is urged that this seldom takes place. Then, Mr. Chairman, there can be little interference occasioned by the provisions of this amendment. This amendment is not intended to interfere with good discipline or with efficiency; it is intended to assist in the conduct of the yards and to prevent occasions arising which might cause feeling between the mechanics in the yards and the enlisted men on the vessels. Many of the employees in the Charlestown Navy Yard live in my district, and I have received letters of complaint from them on this subject. I am glad to see the chairman of the committee accept this, and trust that his decision will be followed finally by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer the following amendment, to follow the last two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add as a separate paragraph following the amendment:

"Provided, That no part of any sum herein appropriated shall be expended for the purchase of structural steel, ship plates, armor, armament, or machinery from any persons, firms, or corporations who have combined or conspired to monopolize the interstate or foreign commerce or trade of the United States, or the commerce or trade between the States and any Territory or the District of Columbia, in any of the articles aforesaid, and no purchase of structural steel, ship plates, or machinery shall be made at a price in excess of a reasonable profit above the actual cost of manufacture. But this limitation shall in no case apply to any existing contract."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, that is the same provision that was agreed to last year.

Mr. CANNON. Have there been any contracts let since that was adopted?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. How was it ascertained as a fact that a maker of structural steel was or was not in the trust?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not been charged with the duty of finding out or ascertaining.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand the Secretary of the Navy made one of the officers make an affidavit.

Mr. CANNON. Now, an affidavit would be a lie without a penalty for perjury. There is a penalty for forming a trust. I am just anxious to know whether this be merely high-sounding "leather and prunella" to show to the galleries and on the stump what we have been doing to break up the trusts, or whether it really be a matter of force.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I recollect that a few years ago an amendment was placed on the bill prohibiting the purchase of any powder from a trust. It was ascertained that the only place the powder could be purchased was from a trust, and the powder was purchased.

Mr. CANNON. In spite of the law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In spite of the law.

Mr. CANNON. Has not the Judiciary Committee been called upon to impeach the official who purchased it for violating the law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. It was expected that a Republican official would violate it. Nobody paid any attention to it.

Mr. CANNON. Then it ought to be expected that a Democratic House would impeach.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It happened when the House was Republican, and nobody expected it.

Mr. CANNON. It is not barred by the statute of limitation now. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add as a separate paragraph the following:

"After January 1, 1914, no captain or commander of the line of the Navy, who is not restricted by law to shore duty only, shall be pro-

moted to the next higher grade who has not performed at least two full years of sea service in cruising ships of the Navy in his grade: *Provided*, That hereafter, except in time of war, no officer shall be appointed a chief of bureau, or to any other position in which his temporary rank shall be more than one grade higher than his rank in the regular service, and in no case shall an officer be appointed a chief of bureau who has not performed two years' sea service in command in the grade of commander and two years' sea service in the grade of captain."

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order and permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I will reserve the point of order, although I assure the gentleman that it is a waste of time, because I shall insist upon it.

Mr. BURLESON. I should like to ask the gentleman if he thinks a commander of the Navy ought to be promoted to be a captain of a ship when he has never served a day at sea as a commander?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. As a general proposition, no; but there are exceptional cases, where it would be an injustice not to promote him.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman state one of those exceptional cases?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Yes; I can state half a dozen.

Mr. BURLESON. State just one, and I will be content.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Here is a commander who is an expert in ordnance, and his services are so valuable to the Government that he is kept on ordnance work, and when his time for promotion comes he has not been able to go to sea as a commander. Ought that man to be retired and his services lost to the Government, when he has been doing the Government most valuable service in designing our guns and perfecting our means of offensive warfare?

Mr. BURLESON. This amendment does not contemplate that such an officer shall be put on the retired list.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Why should the man be kept out of his deserved promotion because he has not seen two years' sea service as commander through no fault of his own? I can cite half a dozen other instances where it would be a hardship not to allow a man to go from one grade to another.

Mr. BURLESON. One further question: Is the gentleman in favor of the petty favoritism that has some time been practiced in the Navy Department by denying some officers shore duty in order that others may be saved from sea service?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman gets his provision into the law there will be a one-man plucking board, because one man, by refusing to detail an officer to sea duty, can force him on to the retired list.

Mr. BURLESON. Have you not under existing law got it in the power of one man now?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. No; because the sea-service requirement is not now a prerequisite to promotion.

Mr. BURLESON. Under the law as it is, is it not within the power of one man now to take an officer of the Navy and make him chief of a bureau, and by keeping him there a few months enable him to retire as an admiral when he has completed 30 years' service?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. No man's promotion to-day depends on his sea service, and it is not in the power of any one man to prevent an officer being promoted. I make the point of order.

Mr. BURLESON. I confidently expected the gentleman from Massachusetts would make the point of order.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Then the gentleman is not disappointed.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the amendment just adopted add the following as a separate paragraph:

"That hereafter the per diem clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger force at navy yards and naval stations under the Navy Department shall be granted leave of absence with pay not to exceed 15 days in any one year, which leave may in exceptional and meritorious cases where an employee is ill be extended, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, not to exceed 15 days additional in any one year."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that. It is legislation.

Mr. CALDER. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I can not. It is too late in the day.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.
The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is requested to consider the advisability of a permanent policy of stationing torpedo boats and submarines at or near the mouth of the Mississippi River and the United States seaports of the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific coast as the proper naval defense thereof.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.
Mr. PADGETT. It is subject to a point of order if the gentleman desires to make it. It is only expressing to the Secretary of the Navy the suggestion of the committee that he shall consider these matters.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will notice, this provision simply authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to investigate this matter in one particular locality.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it says on the Gulf coast and the Pacific coast.

Mr. GOOD. It seems to me if a provision of this kind is proper it ought to give the Secretary of the Navy broader power, so that he can investigate the subject with regard to the advisability of establishing the permanent policy of stationing torpedo boats in the Atlantic and Pacific and at other places.

Mr. PADGETT. He already has some on the Pacific, but not enough, if you will allow me to express my own judgment; but there are on the Atlantic a great many in proportion to what we have. This is simply asking him to consider whether or not it is advisable to have them on the Gulf coast and additional ones on the Pacific coast.

Mr. CANNON. Has he the power to inquire touching that matter now?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee, if I may, what is the use of this amendment? I always bow to the will of the majority, because I must; and we have voted by a great majority to-day that there is no danger of war. Why go to this useless expense? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to introduce one amendment, with one word, and have one minute to explain it. I move at the end of the last line of the bill to insert the word "notwithstanding."

In the minute, if I may be recognized, I desire to say that when I was a small boy there was a queer old creature by the name of Campbell, who could not read or write, and still he was a great correspondent. We used in that time foolscap paper, and he dictated to me until every side of that foolscap of four pages was filled, and then he would dictate until I wrote across, and then finally when I would read the letter to him that contained almost everything known and unknown, seen and unseen, from the birth of Christ to the death of the devil, he said, "Sonny, 'notwithstanding' is a mighty good word to conclude a letter with." [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment by the gentleman from Illinois is withdrawn.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill, with the various amendments, to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HULL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 24565) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back, with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Naval Affairs, to report the same back forthwith, containing the paragraph in the hands of the Clerk, and on that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts opposed to the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Recommit the bill to the Committee on Naval Affairs with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following paragraph: "That for the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President is hereby authorized to have constructed one first-class battleship, carrying as heavy armor and as powerful armament as any vessel of its class, to have the highest practicable speed and the greatest practicable radius of action, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$6,000,000."

The SPEAKER. On that the gentleman moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this vote be taken by yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 106, nays 140, answered "present" 14, not voting 132, as follows:

YEAS—106.

Akin, N. Y.	Green, Iowa	Longworth	Roberts, Nev.
Anderson, Minn.	Greene, Mass.	McCall	Rosenberg
Austin	Groost	McCrary	Sells
Ayres	Hamilton, Mich.	McKinley	Simmons
Barchfeld	Harris	McKinney	Sloan
Bartholdt	Haugen	McLaughlin	Smith, Saml. W.
Bates	Hawley	McMorran	Steenerson
Butler	Hayes	Maher	Stephens, Cal.
Caldor	Heald	Martin, S. Dak.	Sterling
Campbell	Helgesen	Matthews	Stevens, Minn.
Cannon	Henry, Conn.	Miller	Sulloway
Cary	Higgins	Moon, Pa.	Talcott, N. Y.
Catlin	Hill	Morgan	Taylor, Ohio
Crago	Howell	Morse, Wis.	Thistlewood
Curry	Howland	Murray	Tison
Danforth	Humphrey, Wash.	Needham	Towner
Davis, Minn.	Kahn	Nelson	Utter
Dodds	Kennedy	Norris	Volstead
Donohoe	Kent	Nye	Warburton
Draper	Knowland	Palmer	Wedemeyer
Driscoll, M. E.	Konig	Patton, Pa.	Weeks
Esch	Kopp	Payne	Wildor
Farr	La Follette	Powers	Willis
Fordney	Lawrence	Pray	Wilson, Ill.
French	Lee, Pa.	Prince	Wilson, N. Y.
Gardner, Mass.	Lenroot	Rees	
Good	Lindbergh	Roberts, Mass.	

NAYS—140.

Adair	Driscoll, D. A.	Humphreys, Miss.	Rothermel
Adamson	Dupré	Jacoway	Ruby
Alexander	Edwards	Jones	Rucker, Colo.
Allen	Elberbe	Kitchin	Russell
Anderson, Ohio	Estopinal	Konop	Sabbath
Barnhart	Eyans	Korby	Saunders
Bartlett	Faison	Lafcan	Shackelford
Boall, Tex.	Fergusson	Lamb	Sharp
Blackmon	Ferris	Lever	Sherwood
Bocher	Finley	Lewis	Sims
Borland	Fitzgerald	Lloyd	Slisson
Brantley	Flood, Va.	Lobeck	Slyden
Broussard	Floyd, Ark.	McDermott	Smith, N. Y.
Buchanan	Foster	McGillcuddy	Smith, Tex.
Bulkley	Fowler	McKellar	Stephens, Miss.
Burgess	Francis	McKenzie	Stephens, Nebr.
Burke, Wis.	Gallagher	Macon	Stephens, Tex.
Burleson	Garner	Maguire, Nebr.	Stone
Byrns, Tenn.	Garrett	Moon, Tenn.	Sweet
Callaway	George	Moss, Ind.	Taggart
Candler	Glass	Necley	Taylor, Ala.
Claypool	Godwin, N. C.	Oldfield	Taylor, Colo.
Clayton	Goodwin, Ark.	Padgett	Thayer
Cline	Gregg, Tex.	Patten, N. Y.	Trible
Collier	Gudger	Peters	Turabull
Conry	Hamlin	Post	Underhill
Cullop	Hardwick	Pou	Watkins
Dent	Harrison, Miss.	Rainey	Webb
Dickinson	Hay	Raker	Whitacre
Dickson, Miss.	Heftin	Ranch	White
Dies	Hensley	Redfield	Wickliffe
Difenderfer	Houston	Reilly	Wilson, Pa.
Dixon, Ind.	Howard	Richardson	Witherspoon
Doremus	Hughes, Ga.	Robinson	Young, Kans.
Doughton	Hull	Roddenbery	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—14.

Davenport	Fornes	Littlepage	Speer
Davidson	Hardy	Martin, Colo.	Underwood
Dwight	Henry, Tex.	Parran	
Dyer	Johnson, S. C.	Riordan	

NOT VOTING—132.

Alken, S. C.	Anthony	Boehne	Burke, Pa.
Alney	Ashbrook	Howman	Burke, S. Dak.
Ames	Bathrick	Bradley	Burnett
Andrus	Bell, Ga.	Brown	Byrnes, S. C.
Ansberry	Berger	Browning	Cantrill

Carlin	Gray	Levy	Reyburn
Carter	Gregg, Pa.	Lindsay	Rouse
Clark, Fla.	Guernsey	Linthicum	Rucker, Mo.
Concoll	Hamill	Littleton	Scully
Cooper	Hamilton, W. Va.	Loud	Sheppard
Copley	Hammond	McCoy	Sherley
Covington	Hanna	McGuire, Okla.	Slemp
Cox, Ind.	Harrison, N. Y.	McHenry	Small
Cox, Ohio	Hartman	Madden	Smith, J. M. C.
Cravens	Hayden	Malby	Smith, Cal.
Crumpacker	Helm	Mann	Sparkman
Curley	Hinds	Mays	Stack
Currier	Hobson	Mondell	Stanley
Dalzell	Holland	Moore, Pa.	Stedman
Daugherty	Hubbard	Moore, Tex.	Sulzer
Davis, W. Va.	Hughes, N. J.	Morrison	Switzer
De Forest	Hughes, W. Va.	Mott	Talbott, Md.
Denver	Jackson	Murdock	Thomas
Fairchild	James	Olmsted	Townsend
Fields	Johnson, Ky.	O'Shaunessy	Tuttle
Focht	Kendall	Page	Vare
Foss	Kindred	Pepper	Vreeland
Fuller	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Pickett	Wood, N. J.
Gardner, N. J.	Kinkead, N. J.	Plumley	Woods, Iowa
Gillett	Lafferty	Porter	Young, Mich.
Goeke	Langham	Prouty	
Goldfogle	Langley	Pujo	
Gould	Lee, Ga.	Randell, Tex.	
Graham	Legare	Ransdell, La.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Mr. FURNES with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD with Mr. MANN.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Until further notice:

Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. HANNA.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.

Mr. PAGE with Mr. WOOD of New Jersey.

Mr. MCCOY with Mr. VREELAND.

Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. VARE.

Mr. LEVY with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. LEGARE with Mr. REYBURN.

Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. KINDRED with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky with Mr. PICKETT.

Mr. HOLLAND with Mr. MURDOCK.

Mr. HELM with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. HAYDEN with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. GOULD with Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. KENDALL.

Mr. GOEKE with Mr. JACKSON.

Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia with Mr. HINDS.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. HARRISON of New York with Mr. CRUMPACKER.

Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOEHNE with Mr. BOWMAN.

Mr. ANSBERRY with Mr. AMES.

Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. Focht.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina with Mr. GILLETT.

Mr. CARTER with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. TUTTLE with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. STANLEY with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. MALBY.

Mr. HARDY with Mr. OLMSTED.

Mr. JAMES with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. BROWN with Mr. CURRIER.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. SHEPPARD with Mr. BATES.

Mr. MAYS with Mr. THISTLEWOOD.

Mr. LITTLETON with Mr. DWIGHT.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri with Mr. DYER.

Mr. COX of Indiana with Mr. SMITH of California.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. BURKE of South Dakota.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. PARRAN.

On the vote:

Mr. FOSS (to recommit) with Mr. SMALL (against).

Mr. DALZELL (to recommit) with Mr. HENRY of Texas (against).

Mr. VREELAND (to recommit) with Mr. BATHRICK (against).

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania (to recommit) with Mr. BURNETT (against).

Mr. SULZER (to recommit) with Mr. CONNELL (against).

Mr. SPEER (to recommit) with Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania (against).

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY (to recommit) with Mr. ROUSE (against).

Mr. CURLEY with Mr. FULLER.

Mr. PUJO with Mr. DE FOREST.

Until May 28:

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey with Mr. YOUNG of Michigan.

Ending May 31:

Mr. MORRISON with Mr. MADDEN.

Ending June 1:

Mr. THOMAS with Mr. HUBBARD.

Ending June 5:

Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. HARTMAN.

From May 15 and ending two weeks hence:

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. LOUD.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. OLMSTED. I voted "no." I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. HARDY was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I voted "no." I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present." I am paired with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GILLETT.

The name of Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. PADGETT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 16661. An act to relinquish, release, remise, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to all the lands held under claim or color of title by individuals or private ownership or municipal ownership situated in the State of Alabama which were reserved, retained, or set apart to or for the Creek Tribe or Nation of Indians under or by virtue of the treaty entered into between the United States of America and the Creek Tribe or Nation of Indians on March 24, 1832, and under and by virtue of the treaty between the United States of America and the Creek Tribe or Nation of Indians of 9th day of August, 1814; and

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the Senate and House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1912, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SMALL, for one week, on account of death in family.

To Mr. THAYER, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. BORLAND, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. PADGETT, for 10 days, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT-OVER.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, next Thursday is Memorial Day. A great many gentlemen on both sides of the House desire to be absent upon that day. I therefore ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow, Wednesday, it adjourn to meet on Friday, May 31, 1912, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow, Wednesday, it adjourn to meet on Friday, at 11 o'clock. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m., the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 29, 1912, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting estimate for appropriation for reinforcing floor in room 400, Patent Office Building, and to equip same as a file room (H. Doc. No. 779); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting special-agent report on shoe and leather trade in the United Kingdom (S. Doc. No. 719); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to section 2, act of July 7, 1884, schedule of claims allowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 778); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 321) relative to observance of Memorial Day, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 788), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (S. 5207) to provide an American register for the steamer *Occana*, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 793), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 302) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to accept the title to 4,000 acres of land at or near Anniston, Ala., for the purpose of establishing maneuver camps, rifle and artillery ranges, etc., reported in lieu thereof joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) authorizing the Secretary of War to accept the title to 4,000 acres of land in the vicinity of Anniston, in the State of Alabama, which certain citizens have offered to donate to the United States for the purpose of establishing a maneuver camp and for the maneuvering of troops, establishing and maintaining camps of instruction, for rifle and artillery ranges, and for mobilization and assembling of troops from the group of States composed of Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina, accompanied by a report (No. 789), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HEALD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17709) for the relief of John M. Oak, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 764), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2070) for the relief of the estate of Antonia Sousa, deceased, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 765), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18213) to refund to the Sparrow Gravely Tobacco Co. the sum of \$173.52, with penalty and interest, the same having been erroneously paid by them to the Government of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 766), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HEALD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7650) for the relief of I. S. Rogers and J. L. Worthley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 767), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17850) to pay Cowden & Cowden, of Armory, Monroe County, Miss., for the loss of a horse while being used by the Department of Agriculture, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 768), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FRANCIS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20873) for the relief of J. M. H. Mellon (administrator), James A. Mellon, Thomas D. Mellon, Mrs. E. L. Sevir, J. M. H. Mellon, Bessie Blue, Mrs. Simpson, Annie Turley, C. B. Eyer, Luella C. Pearce, John McCracken, A. J. Mellon, J. J. Marlin, Eugene Richmond, Springdale Methodist Episcopal Church, Heidekamp Mirror Co., James P. Confer, jr.,

W. P. Bigley, W. J. Bole, and S. A. Moyer, all of Allegheny County, Pa., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 769), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18294) for the relief of John C. Sullivan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 770), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12476) for the relief of Henry W. Carpenter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 771), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15181) for the relief of Harry S. Wade, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 772), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICKINSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13938) for the relief of Theodore Salus, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 773), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 644) for the relief of Mary E. Quinn, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 774), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14333) for the relief of John Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 775), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16621) for the indemnification of Frank Wenzel, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 776), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 22863) for the relief of H. C. Owens, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 777), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MOTT, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19819) to authorize the payment of \$2,000 to the widow of the late Tranquillino Luna, in full for his contest expenses in the contested-election case of Manzanera against Luna, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 778), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CATLIN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3668) for the relief of William F. Norris, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 779), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12131) for the reimbursement of Ralph E. Hess for two horses lost while hired by the United States Geological Survey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 780), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7672) for the relief of Mary J. Manning, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 781), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICKINSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21760) for relief of the estate of William B. Taylor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 782), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FARR, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20511) for the relief of Samuel Butler & Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 783), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17355) for the relief of Robert F. Scott, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 784), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15594) for the relief of the heirs of those killed by the explosion at Fort Lafayette February 19,

1903, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 785), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FRANCIS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 295) to adjust the claims of certain settlers in Sherman County, Oreg., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 786), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FARR, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 462) for the relief of Slavo Ramadanovitch, heir of Cettigne, a Montenegrin subject, heir and administrator of Marcus Ramadanovitch, alias Radich, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 787), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AINEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14748) to refund certain taxes paid by the heirs of William Hannum, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 790), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21403) for the relief of Bolognesi, Hartfield & Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 791), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CATLIN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4007) for the relief of the J. Kennard & Sons Carpet Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 792), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 23439) granting an increase of pension to Walter K. Kling; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 23832) granting an increase of pension to Clyde C. Elkins; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 24180) granting an increase of pension to Rachel I. Halloway; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 24570) granting an increase of Pension to John Richardson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22462) granting an increase of pension to R. W. Tuffs; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 24423) granting an increase of pension to Martin Kimble; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 23503) granting a pension to John F. Klossy; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16782) granting an increase of pension to Charles Almendinger; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 24422) granting a pension to Charles A. Ward; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 24611) granting a pension to John Y. Thornton; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22397) granting a pension to Thomas Corian; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 23335) granting a pension to Eugene Jobe; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 21791) granting a pension to Anna A. Engel; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22000) granting a pension to Ellen Cardenas; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 19373) granting a pension to Sarah Scott; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 20693) granting a pension to Bertie L. Wade; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13525) granting a pension to James E. Welch; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16879) granting a pension to Martha Fitzpatrick; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 24928) providing for site and public building at Sylvania, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24924) providing for purchase of site and for public building at Millen, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 24925) to amend the copyright law passed March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 24926) to amend paragraph 709 of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1900; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 24927) to regulate the interstate transportation of immature calves; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 24928) regulating trials by jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 554) to print 2,500 copies of the hearings on the investigation of the strike at Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DENT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) authorizing the Secretary of War to accept the title to 4,000 acres of land in the vicinity of Anniston, in the State of Alabama, which certain citizens have offered to donate to the United States for the purpose of establishing a maneuver camp and for the maneuvering of troops, establishing and maintaining camps of instruction, for rifle and artillery ranges, and for mobilization and assembling of troops from the group of States composed of Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, favoring the passage of the three-year homestead bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, asking that said State be permitted to select additional lands within forest reserves; to the Committee of the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requesting an investigation of a certain contract made by the United States Reclamation Service with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 24929) granting a pension to Charlotte C. Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 24930) granting a pension to William G. Park; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24931) granting a pension to Fred A. Hecker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 24932) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Titman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 24933) for the relief of Eli A. Helmick, major, United States Army; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24934) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Duran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 24935) for the relief of the heirs of Alexander K. Phillips, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 24936) granting a pension to George F. Dickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 24937) to correct the naval record of Rev. Oscar Samuel, alias August Meier; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 24938) granting a pension to John W. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 24939) granting a pension to Amanda Dimsdale; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 24940) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Courtenay A. Stovall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 24941) for the relief of William Corley; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 24942) for the relief of the administrator and heirs of John G. Campbell, to permit the prosecution of Indian depredation claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 24943) granting a pension to Thomas B. Kneeder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 24944) granting a pension to Alphonso Penley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 24945) granting an increase of pension to Theoda C. Newlon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24946) to grant an easement to the city of Kingfisher, Okla., for public street purposes, over a strip off the east, west, and south sides of the Government acre, in the city of Kingfisher, Okla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 24947) to establish a fish hatchery and fish-culture station in the first congressional district in the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 24948) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to the John Mangan Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Selby, S. Dak., condemned bronze or brass cannon, with their carriages and outfit of cannon balls, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 24949) granting an increase of pension to Samuel K. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 24950) granting an increase of pension to George De Garmo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24951) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo English; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 24952) granting a pension to Mary A. Swaggerty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 24953) to authorize the appointment of John W. Hyatt to the grade of second lieutenant in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 24954) granting a pension to Rutherford B. H. Kinback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 24955) granting a pension to Flora A. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 24956) for the relief of Ira Haworth; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TALCOTE of New York: A bill (H. R. 24957) granting a pension to Mary A. Snider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARRBURTON: A bill (H. R. 24958) granting a pension to Kate Spencer Carpenter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24959) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 24960) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Kindsman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AKIN of New York: Petitions of citizens of New York; the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Harrisburg, Pa.; and the Immigration Restriction League, favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Southern Sociological Congress, Nashville, Tenn., favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Missouri, in favor of securing a pensionable status for members of the Enrolled Missouri Militia; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: Papers to accompany invalid claim for increase of pension for Charlotte E. Morrison, of Milford, Steele County, State of Minnesota, widow of the late Samuel Morrison, of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to Charlotte C. Morrison, widow of Samuel Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany claim for increase of pension for Charlotte E. Morrison, of Steele County, Minn., widow of late Samuel Morrison, Company D, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, in opposition to any change in present patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, relative to control of floods in the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BOWMAN: Resolution of the Erie Chamber of Commerce, of Erie, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 357, relative to investigation of the business of foreign and domestic fire insurance corporations of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the New York Milk Committee, of New York City, N. Y., favoring continuance of Commission on Efficiency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Samuel Felt Drug Co., of Watertown, N. Y., favoring passage of the Richardson bill (H. R. 14000) relative to pure drugs, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Alice Cleaveland, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of bill for the betterment of conditions in Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the National Jewelers' Board of Trade, of New York City, against passage of amendment changing present patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, resolution of the American Purity Federation, favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Italo-American Alliance of the United States of America, of Philadelphia, Pa., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, favoring placing on a civil-service basis the Diplomatic and Consular Service of the subordinate classes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Sample & Co., of New York City, against passage of the Works bill, relative to license for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the New York State Vegetable Growers' Association, of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring passage of a parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CATLIN: Resolutions of the Merchants' Exchange, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring passage of the Newland river-regulation bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Missouri State Dental Association, favoring passage of Senate bill 5177, amending the patent laws, etc., and resolution opposing bill by Senator CULLOM to restore the so-called Low patent covering crown or bridge work; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, resolutions of Pride of the West Lodge, No. 56, Order B'rith Abraham, of St. Louis, Mo., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of citizens of Troy, N. Y., favoring passage of the Hughes-Borah bill, to create a commission on industrial relations; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of Senate bill 3, known as the Page bill, for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Alexander Lodge, No. 34, Order B'rith Abraham, of Troy, N. Y., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL: Petition of the Woman's Auxiliary of the Board of Missions, Diocese of Central New York, relative to conditions of natives of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the United States Civil Service Retirement Association, of Washington, D. C., against the five-year tenure of office clause contained in House bill 24023; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition of citizens of Chicago, protesting against passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of the Advertising Men's League of New York, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 18327, relative to printing a national directory of commercial organizations of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the United States Civil Service Retirement Association, Washington, D. C., protesting against any legislation that will reestablish the spoils system; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the American Association of Foreign Language Newspapers, against passage of the Oldfield-Brown bills, relating to proposed amendment to patent law, etc.; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of merchants of Leland and Morris, in the twelfth congressional district of Illinois, against passage of a parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of laboring and professional men of Rockford, Ill., favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, favoring certain amendments to the Sherman Antitrust Act, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John Nash, R. F. D. No. 1, Hunlock Creek, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 1339, to grant increase of pension in certain cases; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Resolution of citizens of Chicago, against passage of the Dillingham bill, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of members of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., against passage of the Root amendment, relative to the deportation of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of citizens of the State of Iowa, favoring passage of bill providing for building one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of retail merchants of Hartford, Mich., against passage of the Oldfield-Brown bills, for proposed change in patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 24549, to pension Martha E. A. Ackerman, of Miami, Mo., widow of Thomas Stoker Ackerman, deceased, a teamster in the service of the United States during the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 12 other citizens of Tyner, N. Dak., favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. E. Jacobson and 120 other citizens of Glen Ullin, N. Dak., protesting against the removal of tax from colored oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of a church at Leal, N. Dak., and the Presbyterian churches of Tyner, Backoo, and Cavaller, N. Dak., favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of the Hartford Central Labor Union, Hartford, Conn., favoring passage of House bill 16844, requiring the manufacturer's brand on all goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers of Harrisburg, Pa., favoring passage of the workmen's compensation bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Women's Auxiliary of Windham, Conn., relative to condition of the natives of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the United States Civil Service Retirement Association, protesting against compulsory retirement in civil service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Hebrews of New Britain, Conn., against passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Young People's Eastern Connecticut organizations, favoring passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of 7 merchants of Danbury, Conn., against amendment changing present patent laws; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of J. A. Lawson, of Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring passage of House bill 22339, to regulate the method of directing the work of Government employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Matthew Cullom and other citizens of Utah, against passage of House bill 17593, to divest intoxicating liquors of their interstate-commerce character in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, protesting against change in the present patent laws without the opinion of a committee of experts; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York, favoring passage of the workmen's compensation act (H. R. 20487); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Branch No. 157, East River, Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund, protesting against passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Lithuanian Socialist Federation of America, of Mahanoy City, Pa., protest-

ing against the passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolution of Jacob S. Strahl Lodge, No. 139, Independent Order Ahawas Israel, Brooklyn, N. Y., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of E. Locker & Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of Senate bill 3607, relative to so-called disintegration of the Tobacco Trust; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of citizens of New York, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Jacob S. Strahl Lodge, No. 158, Independent Order Ahawas Israel, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of a mass meeting of Americans, Chicago, Ill., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petition of business men of Alledo, Ill., against passage of a parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Rhode Island Lodge, No. 213, of Providence, R. I., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Rhode Island favoring passage of House bill 22339 and Senate bill 6172, against use of the stop watch in timing Government workmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Eureka, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 22580, for acquisition by the United States of suitable homes for its diplomatic representatives abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of the Daughters of Liberty, East Orange, N. J., and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Harrisburg, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Papers to accompany bill granting pension to Mrs. Flora A. White, of Litchfield, Mich., widow of Charles P. White, deceased, a member of Company H, Fourth Michigan Infantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: Petitions of Local No. 64, Osawatomie, Kans., International Association of Machinists, and Local No. 90, United Brotherhood of Leather Workers on Horse Goods, Fort Scott, Kans., protesting against the use of the stop-watch system on Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, of the State of Kansas, against passage of the workmen's compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of merchants of Fort Scott, Kans., protesting against any legislation that would affect price maintenance; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Petition of Guiding Star Council, Daughters of Liberty, favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TILSON: Resolution of the Connecticut Merchants' Association, against passage of any parcel-post system that is not self-sustaining; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petition of U. S. Grant Post, No. 117, Grand Army of the Republic, in the fifth congressional district of the State of New Jersey, favoring passage of House bill 4070, for relief of veterans whose hearing is defective; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UTTER: Petition of citizens of Rhode Island, favoring passage of House bill 22339, for prohibiting the use of the stop-watch system on Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of South Providence Lodge, No. 328, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, Providence, R. I., protesting against passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Immigration Restriction League, favoring passage of House bill 22527, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEEKS: Resolution of the Immigration Restriction League, favoring passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.